

*Borrowing Authority***PROCEEDING ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please! It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—External Affairs—Zimbabwe—Observance of Human Rights; the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom)—Trade—Export restrictions on branch plants—(a) Request for release of documents. b) Role of United States Government in prohibiting exports; the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle)—Air Canada—Status of RCMP inquiry into transfer of headquarters.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS[*English*]**SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT,
1982-83 (NO. 3)**

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-143, to provide Supplementary Borrowing Authority, as reported (with an amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and motion No. 1 (Mr. Blenkarn).

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I would like at the outset to make two very important points. First, one must never depart from the very basic point that the cost of Government to the people of Canada is what Government spends, not simply the receipts it takes in the form of taxation. The rest of the expenditure which is not covered by taxation is either a concealed tax in the form of inflation or a deferred tax in the form of borrowing. This is really what we are dealing with today. We are dealing with a hidden form of taxation which is concealed through the provision of borrowing.

My second point is that Canadians are not adverse to paying taxes, provided they are assured of obtaining their money's worth. The Government takes in money and redistributes it to various sectors of society, in particular those who are less fortunate than those who are able to produce, and Canadians have demonstrated a compassion and a penchant for sharing. They demonstrate that in support of charities such as programs for the underprivileged, the Cancer Fund and the Heart Fund, etc. Basically, Canadians are a charitable lot, but the point I must make is that today taxpayers do not believe that they are getting their money's worth out of the money spent by the Government on their behalf. As a result, we see that reflected in Revenue Canada statistics in terms of increases in notices of objections to tax assessment, in the number of appeals and in the cost of collecting taxes through Revenue

Canada. There is a general lack of support. The whole system is coming increasingly under attack.

I think we have some very serious problems because the integrity of the system is somewhat at stake. What the Government spends on behalf of the people of Canada and how it spends it are surely two of the most important issues which should be addressed in the House of Commons. Unfortunately, this is not the case because the Government gets its spending authority primarily through closure. Closure has been moved in this particular session of Parliament no less than 20 times. In the majority of those times the issue at hand concerned a financial Bill, a measure of taxation, borrowing or something to do with the financial affairs of the country. The Government is spending money through closure and borrowing money through closure. What is happening is that Parliamentarians do not have the opportunity to examine critically and to challenge effectively the expenditures of Government. The financial management of this country flounders and becomes progressively worse. I heard the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Cosgrove) talk about the responsibility of the Government to manage the financial affairs of the country. I submit to you, Sir, given this kind of borrowing Bill and the projection of a \$30 billion deficit, it is quite clear that financial management is out of control.

• (1610)

Since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has taken office he has managed only once to balance the budget, that was in the 1969-1970 fiscal year and we had a little bit of a surplus in the amount of \$393 million. As the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby) noted, the Prime Minister has accumulated some \$160 billion worth of debt for the people of Canada. When the Prime Minister assumed office, that debt was at \$31 million. The lunatic spending of the 1970s and the deficits of the \$10 billion, \$12 billion, \$15 billion, \$20 billion and now \$30 billion have in some ways tempered Canadian society. They have tempered the shock, the outrage and the anger which should be prevalent today. Today when we talk about a \$30 billion deficit as freely as we do, and the NDP talks about increasing it by another \$10 billion for further job creation, one wonders where we are going. Where are we going in this country? Who would have ever dreamed ten years ago that we would have a \$30 billion deficit?

In 1970, the last time we had a balanced budget—indeed, we had a surplus—total Government spending was \$13.5 billion. There seems to be the feeling that only Governments can create jobs. The Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) cited today some 70-odd projects that could be started if the Government did not provide money but, rather, facilitated the development of these projects which would create jobs.

While Canadians have been tempered in their outrage, they are deeply annoyed. The hard facts are that the tax paying public is not convinced it is getting fair and good value for the money being spent. The current Auditor General is not convinced of that either. He drew attention to many areas of