

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is as follows: (a) \$1,626,204; (b) \$587,633; (c) \$389,000.

Question No. 1,766—**Mr. Stevens:**

For the current fiscal year, what are the estimated expenditures of the Department of the Solicitor General for (a) advertising (b) free or subsidized publications (c) other information conveyed to the public?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General):

	(a) Advertising	(b) Free or Subsidized Publications	(c) Other Information
	\$	\$	\$
Ministry Secretariat	Nil	281,000	36,150
Correctional Service of Canada	31,000	3,000	Nil
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	275,900	282,000	Nil
National Parole Board	Nil	85,000	15,000
	306,900	651,000	51,150

[English]

Mr. Collette: I would ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I would ask that the notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall all those notices of motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: They will stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1981-82

SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bussières (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-59, to provide supplementary borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Madam Speaker, when I began my speech last night I was reviewing briefly the contents of the bill, which consists of four paragraphs intending to achieve something which is not new. This is not the first time it has been done in this House of Commons. We go through this exercise every year, or at least we have been doing it under the Liberal administration since 1970.

In 1970 we had a surplus of \$493 million. Since then it has progressively worsened until the last election when we had a very serious commitment from the Grits that there would be no additional deficits, that the government would make every effort to hold the line and that we would not have to go through this exercise much longer of the House being presented with a bill for borrowing authority without really having it supported by estimates or a budget or any kind of statement on how this money is to be spent. The truth of the matter is that since the election promise the deficit has increased by \$2 billion.

This bill now asks permission from Parliament to go and borrow, a sum of \$14 billion, not just from conventional sources or from domestic sources but from foreign sources as well. The reason it is somewhat different this year is, first of all, because of this lie which stares one in the face, this lie which was uttered in the election campaign, this broken promise that there would be no further increases. More importantly, this year's borrowing bill is different in the sense that it is money which is being spent in much different ways than it has been spent before.

We have been very critical of the government in previous years about the manner in which it has brought in these make-work programs, these schemes which would keep young people employed just long enough to qualify for unemployment insurance. There is an incredible cost associated with these schemes and there has been no major effort to create permanent employment for young people, to encourage them to begin their careers and help them in doing so. That is one kind of criticism. This time it is different as it is associated with another type of spending. This time it is associated with the kind of government takeover spending.

One cannot separate this particular discussion from the takeover. An example of what I am saying is the takeover by the people's oil company, Petro-Canada, of a company called Petrofina. Before I concluded last night I related to my friends