

himself how it will be if ever he returns to power 40 years from now? What would be the situation if we listened to his philosophy because today, two years or maybe two years and a half before the next federal election, he is already bearing down on his candidates asking them to collect funds and send 50 per cent to the national organization, something which has never been done before within the Liberal Party. If he is now taxing his own candidates, how will he be taxing the Canadian people later?

Finally, before I hear him give us some further advice, he who was elected to this House in 1962 and appointed minister in 1965, I am still referring to the current leader of the Liberal Party, who was a member of a Government responsible for the \$240 billion debt with which Canadian are faced, I will tell him that it is to pay this debt and the interests on this debt that today we have to adopt a legislation calling for \$24 billion in borrowing authority. This is partly due to the incompetence of this Liberal Leader who sat in the House for 20 years and did absolutely nothing except increase our indebtedness year after year.

Finally, Madam Speaker, before listening to the negative comments of the Leader of the Liberal Party on our legislation, I think he would be well advised to check the position of the rank and file of his own Party concerning the cruise missile issue and the stand taken at its last convention in November 1986. At that convention, his Party proposed an extraordinary child care project which would cost Canadian taxpayers \$11.2 billion a year, Madam Speaker.

Before he starts commenting on our budget, I should like him to tell us how he is planning to finance his own Party's proposal of a child care system which would cost Canadians \$11.2 billion a year; I should like him also to explain to the House how he is planning to set up a guaranteed income program for all Canadians. Such programs are good—socialists are experts at that—but I think it is a good idea first to find out how much they will cost. I should like, therefore, the Leader of the Liberal Party to explain to us how he is planning to finance this new guaranteed income concept. I should like him to tell us in his masterly fashion what costs are associated with the recommendations made at the November 1986 Liberal convention.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I should like to comment on some of the statements made by the Leader of the Socialist Party concerning our legislative program and our economic message of February 1987. First of all, before speaking of a country's finance, the leader of the Socialist Party should explain to us why the financing of his own Party is questioned in a decision rendered in July 1986 by Hon. Justice John White, of the Supreme Court of Ontario, indicating that the fund obtained by the unions under the Rand Formula—the Rand Formula compels employers to collect money every week from the pay cheques of unionized and non-unionized employees alike. But all these contributions received from the union are used to enrich the Socialist Party. But Mr. Justice White ruled that the union could not use for purposes other than those of the

Borrowing Authority

union the amounts thus collected by the unions by payroll deductions of non-unionized employees.

I mentioned this in the House on a number of occasions, Madam Speaker, and Socialists sitting on opposite benches should listen to me first and tell me where they stand on this particular issue, and if they want to enlighten us about the budget of our Government, they should explain first to the Canadian public why they use these funds illegally obtained to finance their own Party.

Since they keep bragging about the honesty and the openness of their Party, I should like them to tell me why—and here I quote the Minister of Justice who directed in vain this question to the Leader of the Socialist Party—they are using stamps provided by Parliament, meaning Canadian taxpayers' money, to send their political literature to the St-John-East Riding in Newfoundland. On this issue, again, the Leader of the Socialist Party did not know what to say. Therefore, before he starts questioning our budget, I should like him to explain his position on this issue.

Finally, I would like to say something to socialists throughout the world and ask them whether they are aware of the fact that the leader of the socialist party in this House gets \$101,700 a year and that he has not only refused to accept the pay cut agreed to by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Cabinet Ministers of this Conservative Government but he has also negotiated for a chauffeur and a car.

Before trying to tell us what to do, and I understand that my time is running short, Madam Speaker, they should think about those matters and about how they use Government services improperly. They are very silent today, which is surprising. They should explain their position to us and think about the White ruling and about Professor Lavigne, who discovered the NDP financing scandal. Then, they can comment on our budget. For all these reasons, Madam Speaker, I hope that the Members of this House will support this borrowing authority bill so that the neediest people in Canada, whom we are always trying to protect, will be able to receive their money in good time.

• (1540)

[English]

Mr. Orlikow: I wish to correct an impression which the Hon. Member may have left with anybody who happens to read a copy of his speech. The decision of Mr. Justice White that the Member talks about was not a decision regarding the use of union dues for political contributions, it was a decision which strikes at the ability of unions to do almost anything for their members. If that decision is carried to its logical conclusion, unions would be precluded from urging their members to support a better pension plan, or from urging their members to defend the universal medicare or hospital insurance plan. That is what that decision would result in. The unions are appealing that decision. They are quite hopeful, as are we, that if the