

The Budget—Mr. Olson

several times that the whole responsibility for the present dispute in the Middle East and for the hatred and so on which have been built up can be and should be laid at the door of Christendom and the western civilization.

I am not attempting to exonerate Christendom and the western civilization from their fair share of the responsibility, in whatever context one wishes to put it, but I should like to say this and give an example. I sat in the United Nations general assembly last fall when voluntary contributions were being received for the United Nations refugee commissioner. There was, I believe, a request for \$30 million for the refugee fund, most of which is used for the Palestine refugees in the Gaza strip and other camps in the Middle East. There are other places where it is used but a very large percentage is used for the relief of the refugees there. Out of the \$30 million, \$22 million was volunteered by the United States of America. I am not sure of the exact amount but somewhere between \$1.3 million and \$1.5 million was volunteered by Canada. The balance of the \$30 million was volunteered by such countries as the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, and so on. Not one cent was volunteered by any socialist country in eastern Europe.

I do not wish to pour salt on sore wounds, but the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands repeatedly stated that the whole problem of the refugees and the difficulties which arise from that problem should be laid at the door of western civilization and Christendom. I think it is well for us to be reminded once in a while of the facts before we swallow this kind of conclusion, notwithstanding the fact that we can recognize the problem as he pointed it out.

We are faced with a prospective of some \$740 million in this fiscal year. I am not opposed to the government increasing expenditures when authorized by a vote or there is agreement in the house that this is what we should do. But I believe the Canadian public and the Canadian taxpayers, who ultimately must pay for all these expenditures, should be presented with the bill for these so-called acceptable expenditures as soon as possible after they are made.

All that a deficit does in any fiscal year is to postpone, sometimes briefly and sometimes a little longer, the day of reckoning, the day when the taxpayer must face up to the fact that these expenditures have been made by parliament. Therefore I suggest to the minister, although it may not have been politically

[Mr. Olson.]

wise at that point and may have been an unpleasant task, that consequent upon the request for legislation and the expenditures which were passed by the house he should have brought in a budget as soon as possible after the legislation was passed so that the taxpayers would have been presented with the bill. I say that because the relationship between the so-called expenditures and the obligation to pay the price is lost if it is postponed.

Further, we disagree that there should be a large deficit at this time. If there is any time in Canadian economic history when we ought to be at least balancing the budget, if not budgeting for a surplus to pay off some of the past indebtedness, surely it is in a time when economic conditions are reasonably buoyant. I do not believe that conditions will get a great deal better than they are in this fiscal year 1967-68. If we cannot meet our expenses in this kind of a situation, when in heaven's name will we be able to?

I should like to turn now to another subject, the matter of how the minister will raise these cash requirements. The Minister of Finance has suggested that his net additional cash requirement for this fiscal year will be \$1,520 million, some of which will be used for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, some of which will be used for the Farm Credit Corporation, and some of which will be used for loans to governments and to pay the deficit.

If we are to be faced with this kind of deficit or national debt in Canada, I would certainly hope that the minister will expand a practice which has been started. I hope he will obtain a larger share of that money from the Bank of Canada. In a discussion earlier this year we heard the minister say in the house that the Bank of Canada over the last five years has been expanding the amount of the money supply on an average of about \$200 million per year. I commend him and the other persons responsible for this. However, in a year when we are faced with a requirement for \$1,520 million in additional net cash, I suggest that an amount of \$200 million coming from the Bank of Canada is an insufficient proportion.

We could become involved in a long argument about how much the money supply will increase during this fiscal year. I am sure the Minister of Finance will agree with me when I say it is not unusual to see a greater increase in the money supply in those years when the government budgets for a deficit