

Adjournment Debate

fiscal projections—national accounts and public accounts comparison.

[Editor's note: Table referred to above is as follows:]

TABLE 4.1
FISCAL PROJECTIONS—NATIONAL ACCOUNTS AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMPARISON

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	(\$ millions)				
Revenues					
Public Accounts—budgetary revenues	40,159	45,200	52,935	61,600	69,420
(per cent change)	(14.0)	(12.6)	(17.1)	(16.4)	(12.7)
National Accounts—total revenues	45,187	51,630	63,590	74,105	84,125
(per cent change)	(14.3)	(14.3)	(23.2)	(16.5)	(13.5)
Expenditures					
Public Accounts—total outlays	52,962	59,950	67,625	74,725	82,275
(per cent change)	(9.1)	(13.2)	(12.8)	(10.5)	(10.1)
National Accounts—total expenditures	54,412	63,550	73,650	82,600	91,625
(per cent change)	(10.3)	(16.8)	(15.9)	(12.2)	(10.9)
Net position					
Public Accounts—financial requirements	-10,445	-12,155	-10,980	-8,415	-7,155
National Accounts—balance	-9,225	-11,920	-10,060	-8,495	-7,500

Mr. Bosley: The government has now embarked upon a new process. That process is to enter in net figures. It has been done for some time with respect to minor items. It is now proposed to be added under the petroleum compensation account. The effect is that the government will no longer be showing its true expenditures and true revenues but only showing net figures. If one looks at Table 4.1 one will find the actual expenditures of the government will not be the same as what the public accounts figures show, but \$2 billion more in 1979-80. They are projected to be nearly \$9 billion more than the public accounts projections in 1983-84.

● (2205)

If one takes those numbers, which are the true spending figures of the government, as a percentage of GNP, one will find that the percentage rises from 20.9 per cent to 22.3 per cent of the GNP in the last year, and the rate is higher in every other year. I rise tonight to say that I am partly worried by the attempt of the Minister of Finance, but I presume that because he does not know his figures, he is not purposely misleading the House. I am more worried by the fact that the government is committed to the never-ending policy of taking more and more out of the economy of Canada, thereby leaving less and less for other people with which to work. As one who has had municipal experience with projections three and four years hence, I know that those projections will be wrong. For instance, in the first table to which I referred, the GNP is projected to rise by 14.1 per cent and by 12.6 per cent. I suggest that that projection is quite optimistic.

What is wrong is not that the government is pretending that it will not increase its share of the GNP, but by actually increasing its share, the government will make it more difficult for Canadians to create jobs. The Minister of Finance in describing his financial objectives refers to the policy of gradualism. Although it is not clear in the minister's statements, it is quite clear from the tables that the minister's policy is one of

gradualism—to gradually destroy this economy and to gradually put everybody in Canada out of work.

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in listening to what the hon. member said, I find it very difficult to find anything in his last statements which I would consider to be of parliamentary value. Certainly, any hon. member who would accuse another hon. member—in fact a minister of the Crown—of intentionally destroying the economy of the country must be in great disrepute in his own mind for even thinking such a thing. It is absolutely asinine and it is simply not true. The hon. member must admit that he has overstated his case by a very long degree.

The fact is that according to the budget papers in 1979-80, federal expenditures will be 20.3 per cent of the gross national product and for the fiscal year 1983-84 federal expenditures will be 20.3 per cent of the gross national product. Any elementary arithmetic will indicate that the growth rate necessary to get from 20.3 per cent of the gross national product to 20.3 per cent of the gross national product is precisely the growth rate of the gross national product. It does not take a genius to figure that out.

If the hon. member is implying that the federal government will generate inflationary expectations by increasing the deficit, financial requirements and expenditures in that way, then how does he explain the figures shown in the budget which indicate, for example, that the financial requirements will decline from \$10.4 billion in 1979-1980 to \$7.2 billion in 1983-1984. How does the hon. member explain the deficit figures which would see a reduction in the deficit from \$11.4 billion in 1979-1980 to a figure of somewhat less in the fiscal year 1983-1984.

The budget papers speak for themselves. The growth in government expenditures are clearly there for all to see, the deficit reduction figures are clearly there for all to see, and the financial requirements are clearly there for all to see. Indeed,