

**Mr. Boudria:** Those are the Members who were elected with the tide. That is why I call them that. Those Conservative Members must wish that they had lost the last election so that they could receive big rewards like the ones given to Lawrence Hannigan and Roy McMurtry, another loser at the provincial level for the Ontario leadership. He went on to a plum job in Britain. None of the voters in my constituency received plum jobs in Britain at \$135,000 or \$114,000 per year. Many of those people are still concerned about the deficit, but they are more concerned about unemployment in my area. They are more concerned with trying to obtain jobs and ensuring that they will continue to receive unemployment insurance benefits because jobs are not forthcoming. The farmers of my riding are not worried about calculating how to invest \$135,000 pay cheques. They are worried about keeping their farms. Those are the worries of my constituents. When I see their concerns and when I see some of the waste of the Conservative Government, which pledged on one hand to spend more and on the other hand to spend less, I really wonder about the sincerity of its members during the last election campaign.

Of course the Hon. Member for Halifax West was very sincere when he brought in this motion, but he needs to do a lot of lobbying with Cabinet Ministers about their own personal way of spending government funds and about the way in which the Government is handing out patronage appointments right, left and centre, to everyone. Once they start setting that example in the House of Commons and in the Government of Canada, and once we see the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) cut back that massive increase in the budget of his own office, that 57 per cent increase over the budget of the previous Prime Minister, we will believe that they are sincere. Only a few years ago Conservative Members criticized the previous Prime Minister because they claimed that his office was too large. This attitude of bourgeoisie on the part of the Government is totally unacceptable to my constituents and to other people of Canada. It is my hope that the Government will change its policies.

As much as I agree with the principle suggested by the Hon. Member for Halifax West, I think Conservative back-benchers on both sides of the House should be speaking with their Cabinet Ministers and telling them to reduce the size of the used car lot at the west door, their large fleet of limousines. They should tell them to stop spending money. They have spent almost \$100,000 renovating the offices of Cabinet Ministers on the Hill. One particular Minister, the Minister of Mines, whoever that is, spent \$18,000 putting new wallpaper in his office. The Government talks about reducing the deficit. It should take a mirror and look at itself and the kind of job it is doing. Government Members want to commit Canada to spending more on arms and in other such areas, to spend more on defence and military uniforms, to spend more on limousines and the lavish lifestyles of Cabinet Ministers and the Prime Minister, but they want to spend less on the poor. That is not deficit reduction; that is reorganization of priorities in such a way as to increase the deficit by taking away from the poor

### *Income Tax Act*

and giving to the rich. Those are the policies of the Government, and I do not agree with them.

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to participate in the debate on the motion of the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) which essentially asks us to make the Government of Canada a charitable organization. If that were the real intention of the Hon. Member, perhaps he should suggest to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Beatty) that the Government of Canada be given a charitable donation number so that we could then solve the problems with which we are faced today. What a naive, foolish, simplistic approach the Hon. Member is introducing. Imagine making the Government of Canada a charitable organization!

Perhaps it is not all that far-fetched, given the track record of the present Government. It could very well run the country and the Government into a situation where the Government needs to become a charitable organization.

● (1740)

It is amazing to hear government Members talk, in their very simplistic way, about the causes of the deficit as well as the solutions that they propose. I suspect that the proposal in front of us today for reducing the deficit makes about as much sense as what we have heard so far in terms of serious economic policy which the Government has introduced.

When dealing with the deficit, you are really dealing with two questions: one, your expenditures, and two, your revenues. Unfortunately, government Members have been quite concerned with the expenditure side. All too often during the campaign, in the right wing rhetoric that we have heard in the last number of years, we have been told that the problem with the deficit is that we are living beyond our means, we have had too much government expenditure, essentially it is those people on welfare, those hangers-on who are sucking the system dry, it is time we put our house in order, cut those programs and lived "within our means". In that way economic recovery will occur, new wealth will be created, et cetera, et cetera. In all of the key words and phrases that one can use in this quite simplistic way their solution is to be found. Never do we hear from government Members and government spokesmen about the government revenue part of this equation. They never talk about the type of tax breaks that wealthy Canadians and large corporations have been receiving. There is never one peep out of them about that, just an attack on government expenditures.

A study of OECD countries has shown that as far as social expenditures are concerned, Canada is approximately at the bottom. Italy, Ireland, France, Germany, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, the United States, Great Britain, all spend more of their gross national product on social expenditures than we in Canada. To say that compared to other western civilized countries we are spending more or living beyond our means is absolute nonsense. Certainly compared to other western industrialized countries, we are not spending beyond our means. In fact, we have a pretty poor track record in this regard.