

Supplementary Borrowing Authority

1979, the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) requested a list of current capital projects that were experiencing cost overruns. Treasury Board compiled a list of overruns of \$1.1 billion. All of the overruns had occurred under the Liberals. In addition, he identified a further \$920 million in overruns before the year was out.

Another area is employee efficiency. A study conducted by the Auditor General found that work performed by 50,000 clerical and regulatory employees could have been done by 38,000 employees.

Then there are the expensive, inefficient white elephants such as Mirabel Airport. This unnecessary and unwanted airport cost the taxpayers of Canada \$500 million to build and has lost over \$200 million since operations began in 1975. In the last fiscal year, 1981-82, Mirabel lost \$30 million. In contrast, Malton Airport in Toronto had a profit of \$39 million.

Then there is the wasteful expenditure on administrative expenses, including the \$150,000 sabbatical being enjoyed by Dr. W. Edmund Clark in Paris. Dr. Clark was the head of the energy sector at the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and was the bureaucrat responsible for developing the National Energy Program, which resulted in the loss of billions of dollars of drilling activity in Alberta and the loss of thousands of jobs. Documents leaked in September show that Dr. Clark is being paid an overseas adjustment of more than \$6,000, relocation expenses of \$25,000, education allowances of \$5,000, living allowances of \$33,000, and \$2,000 for travel and research. All this is in addition to his salary, which is in excess of \$80,000 per year.

In my own city, just down the block from me, resides a government official who is in charge of Transpo 86, the World Fair on Transportation and Communications. The rent on his apartment is \$4,000 per month for five years. His neighbour in the same building pays \$1,500 per month. When this was brought to the attention of the then secretary of state for External Affairs, an aide described this wasteful expenditure of \$3,500 per month for five years as chickenfeed.

I sense among my own constituents a resolution that in a country of such enormous wealth as Canada, in terms of both its resources and its people, there must be better ways to reach our potential.

● (2010)

Our Party has developed a ten-point program which was described last night by our finance critic. It is our contribution to a national recovery program. In brief summary, because it was well described last night by the Hon. Member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson), we suggest a control of the deficit and that the Government spending policy be contained. We would simplify the Income Tax Act and encourage risk taking. We would create a positive investment climate by reforming FIRA in order to support the dollar. We would amend the National Energy Program to reduce red tape and remove the retroactive confiscation feature which is considered such an

unpleasant part of it. We would reduce red tape and unnecessary regulations. We would develop new technology through more aggressive research and development policies. We would emphasize training and upgrading of the labour force so that Canadians could take advantage of our new job opportunities and technology.

This may mean that employers would have to train people who would leave them in the future and that unions would have to be more realistic about retraining programs, but I think that is a responsibility which they are now prepared to share.

We would implement mini-projects as well as megaprojects and identify small business opportunities. We would continue to reduce interest rates and, in particular, moderate increases in regulated prices. Finally, we would expand Canada's trade potential, particularly in the Pacific Rim which is our front door on the fastest growing economic region of the world. This is what we would consider to be a constructive program which in time would, hopefully, eliminate the need for debates such as this one on excessive Government borrowing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have the dubious distinction tonight of rising to speak on Bill C-128, an Act to provide supplementary borrowing authority for \$4 billion. It is not unrealistic to ask in what context this request is before us this evening. Of course, the most obvious statistic which jumps to one's attention is the fact that unemployment in the country is now in the 12.2 per cent range, meaning that approximately two million people are out of work in Canada.

Mr. Blenkarn: It is really 17.5 per cent.

Mr. Riis: In real terms it is 17.5 per cent, as my hon. friend suggests. Yesterday the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) said that we should not worry too much about this figure because he has a job-creation program which he is introducing. He is saying, "So what if two million people are out of work; we will create jobs in the next year and a half for 60,000 people." That still leaves approximately two million people out of work. The Government seems to think that this is an economic statement of which it can feel proud. It is beyond me, it escapes logic.

Also the Minister of Finance had the courage—and I give him credit where credit is due—to suggest that unemployment will continue in 1982 at the 12 per cent rate. His Department suggested that for the next five years it will be in the double-digit range, at least. I read with interest the suggestion of the Conference Board that in 1983-84 it will be about 13 per cent. Another prediction agency suggested as high as 14 per cent for the next year or two. Can we listen to the facts and figures which come out of the Department of Finance? Can we have any faith in the figures which come out of Government departments?

I remember very distinctly about a year ago when the then minister of finance rose and said that he was very disappointed