

on both sides of the House will convince me that the consumer does not bear that cost in the price he pays for the product. It does not matter whether it is a Crown corporation or a private corporation; both have to recover the cost of their borrowings. If I am wrong about that, I hope someone gets up and tells me.

● (2150)

An hon. Member: Keep going.

Mr. Benjamin: The other things I would like these private enterprisers on both sides of the House to show me is one instance where a private company returned part of its profit to the consumer and not just the shareholders. I would like all these big-wheel private enterprisers and barefoot boys from Bay Street to show me an instance where a lovey-dovey finance company, which built into their charges the cost of borrowing on which they made a profit, returned to their customers a share of that profit. I am willing to be converted, Mr. Speaker, if they can show me—

Mr. Ellis: Stay where you are!

Mr. Benjamin: —where that happened. Go to an “anal” meeting of Cominco, Inco or the CPR and listen to all these beautiful free enterprise investors. Does the little old lady in running shoes from the local Tory convention with her \$100 worth of shares have any say? It is like the Tory convention last weekend where they brought in a bunch of foreigners who had all the say, and it was to hell with policy, let us just play politics. Go to the annual meeting of a corporation and see how much say the average shareholder has in the operation of that company. The truth of the matter is, none whatsoever. At least, Mr. Speaker, with a Crown corporation we have a chance to get back at them. I invite my hon. friend to buy one share in Canadian Pacific and go to their next “anal” meeting and see how far he gets with a motion from the floor. He will not get anywhere. He will be ruled out of order; it is all decided by five or ten people. At least with a Crown corporation whether it is owned by the federal or provincial government, we can call it to account.

Mr. Gamble: Where?

Mr. Benjamin: Right in here.

Mr. Huntington: How?

Mr. Benjamin: Where have you guys been? You have had lots of opportunity. When we were in committee and dealt with annual reports of Crown corporations, where were these free enterprisers? All they want to know is how to get rid of them; they do not ask about accountability.

Mr. Gamble: What meeting have you ever attended?

Mr. Benjamin: If you watch some of these right-wing nit-wits from the two so-called major parties, when they have an opportunity to do something about the accountability of a

Crown corporation, they blow it. Then they come in here and condemn the principle of Crown corporations.

The hon. member called into question the fact that a Crown corporation is in the name of Her Majesty. He better check the laws of this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Benjamin: By the way, we are going to vote with the official opposition on this one, but for different reasons.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, for any hon. member to suggest that this legislation is going to give something automatically and for all time is either sheer ignorance or sheer stupidity. There is no such thing. The hon. member should know better than to make those kinds of statements instead of appealing to the worst—

Mr. Clark: Read the bill.

Mr. Benjamin: —in people, instead of appealing to other people to agree with his ignorance.

Mr. Clark: What day is it, Les?

Mr. Benjamin: It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman makes no protest about massive losses in private corporations when tens of thousands of consumers are hit and thousands of shareholders lose everything; but when a Crown corporation does, he gets up and says they are bad.

● (2200)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FINANCE—PROJECTED BUDGET DEFICIT. (B) FOREIGN AID
EXPENDITURES—REQUEST FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, on Friday I had the occasion to ask two questions of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussières). The first dealt with the serious deteriorating nature of our current deficit. I made reference to the fact that the deficit was originally projected six months ago to stand in the amount of \$10.49 billion. I asked the Minister of State for Finance whether the Department of Finance had prepared new projections as to what the deficit for the current year would be. The question was founded upon the presumption, logically arrived at, that having regard to the massively increased costs incurred by the government as a consequence