

would force the managers in the system to go back and justify the nature of those original programs in terms of the objectives they were designed to serve and see how relevant they are today. I would turn the programs back to the managers and redefine in narrow terms the objectives of those programs. I would tell the managers to manage to these objectives and to manage efficiently.

In the area of discretionary spending, Sir, we are dealing with 15 per cent of total government spending. We cannot correct the whole ball of wax when dealing with 15 per cent of government spending. I would like to call for a debate in the House without the television cameras and without *Hansard* which would be an *in camera* session. We could then talk out the problem with transfer payments to the provinces, the use the federal Government makes of those transfer payments, the use the provincial governments make of those transfer payments and the wasteful competition that goes on between those two political levels in terms of the same taxpayers' dollar. I can tell you that within the first year we could find \$5 billion if we really had the guts and the political courage to do so.

I am trying to be as concise as I can, Mr. Speaker. We could simply look at the Auditor General's report to see that there are hotel operations in New Brunswick which are simply scandalous. People should be in jail over those operations. What about Deputy Ministers of Departments who are responsible for Consolidated Computer or for Canadair? At least \$1.4 billion is wasted there. Those Deputy Ministers should not be around any more or should be brought before a parliamentary committee and examined in order to see if they need to be disciplined. There is no discipline or managerial control in the system. There is nothing in the system that delivers top value for the Canadian dollar. The whole system needs to be reorganized.

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed by the comments made by the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) regarding the—

Mr. Blais: But you are not surprised.

Mr. Ferguson: I am not surprised at the comments made about the silting of the salmon spawning streams in British Columbia. Just two weeks ago, a fisherman came into my office expressing this same concern and he was not aware of the Environment 2000 program which was established by the Government of Canada to assist communities and municipalities in cleaning up the environment and making the necessary corrections. This program is designed to clean up streams and to plant more trees, which is actually within provincial jurisdiction but the provinces are not doing anything about it. In order to get this information to Canadians—

Mr. Blenkarn: Have you read the Fisheries Act? The fisheries is a federal responsibility.

Mr. Ferguson: And forestry is a provincial responsibility. It is because of the depletion of our forests that this has happened. Consequently, is it not logical that the Government of

Borrowing Authority Act

Canada should pay for advertising to make these programs known to Canadians? These programs are connected to the environment, and without our forests, the spawning grounds will not be viable and the fisheries cannot continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt but the question period is finished.

Some Hon. Members: Continue.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1210)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Please hear the Chair out. I am bound by the Standing Orders which state very clearly that there will be a period of not more than 10 minutes for questions and comments. If the House wishes to allow the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) to respond, I am in the hands of the House. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret it is not agreed.

Mr. Blenkarn: He asks a question and then won't let the Member answer.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I draw to your attention and to the attention of the House that unanimous consent was denied by the person who asked that scurrilous, misleading, improper question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Debate. The Hon. Member for Welland (Mr. Parent).

Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate for two or three days. I have come to a couple of conclusions regarding the speech of the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). First of all, there is no question that he believes in his heart all the things that he said. There is no question that he feels very irate and frustrated. I can well understand that when he delivers a speech like that in the House he is going to become quite emotional. I propose to address a couple of points made by the Hon. Member and others and I will try to bring some rationality to the debate so that we can get away from the emotional side of it.

The opposition Parties have focused on a few major points in connection with Bill C-21, claiming that the contingency amount is irresponsible. I want to talk about responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Quite contrary to indicating that the Government is acting in an irresponsible way, the request for a contingency amount indicates, in my judgment, realistic and responsible planning on the part of the Government. The contingency amount has traditionally been included in the request for borrowing authority. In earlier years when new borrowing authority was sought by way of appropriation Bills, a contingency amount was always included. In recent times,