

strength of our public service in Canada was 221,000 and he said he would reduce it. On the last recorded entry, Mr. Speaker, with respect to our total federal civil service, we find that there are 580,000 employees in the federal government.

Let me put it another way: just before the Prime Minister took office there was one federal employee for every 30 taxpayers in this country. Today it is one federal employee for every 15 Canadian taxpayers. If we express it yet another way, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the taxpayers of this country have increased by only about 50 per cent, the total number in the bureaucracy employed by the federal government has gone up by 155 per cent. That is why it is important to reduce the size of the public service by allowing attrition to take hold.

We believe that it is time to stop filling the vacancies that occur in the public service so that the government may get that service down to a more manageable level. That is why the Conservative party has advanced the idea that it is time to have zero base budgeting and sunset laws in Canada to review various programs.

I have said certain critical things about the budget. I would like hon. members to know that we welcome the 150 per cent increase that has been put into this budget in regard to research and development. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are disappointed that the minister did not go further. As the minister probably knows, he has merely brought his government back to the point that the Diefenbaker government already had us in in the 1960s with regard to research and development. The Liberal government cancelled that program in 1965.

We are pleased that the budget now allows the family farm to include corporate family farms where capital gains are concerned. It is a good move, and I am pleased that the government have responded to those requirements. I am also pleased that the registered retirement savings plans have been made a little more flexible to deal with the moneys that people have accumulated in anticipating retirement. Those are good measures.

Generally speaking, we must accept that this budget is a patch up job. The government has taken a line from here and a line from there. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the government has even taken a line from Edgar Benson's old budget,

*The Budget—Mr. Stevens*

and that is going back a few years. In short, this budget tonight is not relevant to the critical economic situation Canada is in today. It has been framed by those whose thinking is rather stale, and who, in fact, have a vested interest in previous mistakes. I do not doubt that within three months this budget will be completely forgotten by all, with the possible exception of those who wrote it.

In considering this budget, let us not forget that it would likely not be before us tonight had it not been at the insistence of Washington. This budget is a necessary preliminary to the filing of a further prospectus in Washington which must reveal the fiscal 1979 figures for this government. In other words, it is not the tragic unemployment situation in Canada that has triggered the budget; it is not our inflation figures, our falling dollar or our lack of real growth. It is simply a budget that has been dictated by Washington to meet the requirements of the Wall Street barons who might be asked to lend further money to this government.

I hope to be given an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to continue with certain further remarks concerning this budget at a later date. At this point, it can be summed up by simply noting that with the size of the deficit put before the House tonight, the government has revealed that, based on its estimates for the deficit for 1978, it is 43 per cent out. In short, the deficit that we have now as revealed tonight for 1978 is 43 per cent higher than we were led to believe on March 31, 1977. Who could afford such miscalculation?

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this moment to move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield):

That the debate be now adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

On motion of Mr. Stevens the debate was adjourned.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council):** I should like to move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

On motion of Mr. MacEachen the House adjourned at 9.19 p.m.