

*The Budget—Mr. Marshall*

finance and the sheriff of Parliament Hill do not have the masses with them. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians are not going to put up with tax reform under the guise of fighting inflation.

Far be it from me to oppose the presentation of a budget; but I do say that in failing to include measures to combat unemployment, which is reaching crisis proportions in certain regions—and these not short of urban-industrial content—the budget takes on a disturbing confrontation with many people in Canada. I refer in particular to what might be described as the country's self-inflicted unemployment, or instant unemployment as a result of austerity.

I find this situation to be a sad commentary on a government which, already famous for its inability to create an adequate number of new jobs, is now doing away with old ones. This government is trying to fight inflation by adopting a method that might be compared to the "pill". The government is trying to introduce prevention, but is forgetting the side effects, effects that can only be described as alarming and which in many respects are leading to economic infertility.

For these and other reasons, it is difficult for me to understand the attitude of this government. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in his usual aggressive manner, said in a recent speech:

We will not be bullied or blackmailed by hysterical charges or threats from opponents of the government's white paper on tax reform.

What an example of psychology in reverse! I should like to know who is doing the bullying around here. Who is being hysterical and who is making the threats? For example, who did the bullying when our NATO commitments were cut back, seriously affecting our prestige in the alliance? Who did the bullying when the strength of the Canadian forces was decreased to some 82,000 troops, which is but a political token of a military force? This force, as the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) or the chief of the general staff will admit, is fast reaching a state of ineffectiveness for performing the role we are supposed to play in our national defence effort.

If we knew what was in the hearts and minds of our military leaders instead of having to listen to what they are told to say, then we would know just what our capabilities are. Some of our great military leaders, who in the last two years have retired in disgust, must find it difficult to accept the

argument that one of the top priorities for our forces is the national development.

A few nights ago the minister of external affairs, during the television program "Encounter", said that Canada would be the battleground between the United States and any foreign force that directed missiles at the United States. Yet, as Canadians we are led to believe that this government is being sincere in reducing our defence spending by cutting down on the strength of the forces. All we are really doing is wasting that which is left of our budget and making our forces ineffective.

The maintenance of an effective military force is a necessary evil in these troubled times. As much as none of us wants war, if our country is worth preserving we must ensure that we will be prepared at any moment to deter attack and to share in a worth-while contribution to maintain peace in foreign lands. Let us not be hypocritical by wasting our defence spending on a mere token group of people in military uniforms. Some people in Canada oppose defence spending. If I may be permitted I should like to refer to an article that appears in today's *Globe and Mail* and refers to a Nazi officer who has been charged with 15,314 counts of murder. Let the people of Canada not forget this.

How can we keep talking about restraint in spending and at the same time set up a new department called Information Canada, to which over \$7 million has been allocated in the 1970-71 budget? This is a prime example of duplication of effort and expense. Let me just look at the objectives of this body for a moment. Its objectives are to explain the many aspects of federal government policies and programs to Canadians, and to provide information that will assist the government to assess what Canadians think about federal policies and programs. I say that this is absolute hypocrisy. I am sure that the white paper on tax reform got the message across to Canadians; and I am also sure that the Minister of Finance must be able to assess the thinking of Canadians, and to do so at no charge.

What are Members of Parliament for, Mr. Speaker, if it is not to bring to the attention of their constituents the policies of the government? Perhaps this new organization emphasizes the lack of faith that the Prime Minister has in Members of Parliament. I repeat that this expenditure is an utter waste of the taxpayers' money and is nothing short