

er from Thunder Bay, who must attempt to defend this borrowing authority Bill. That Hon. Member indeed danced around in a vacuum and really gave no explanation, as far as I am concerned, for the horrendous debt which this Bill intends to impose on the people of Canada.

Bill C-21 is a short Bill; it has three paragraphs. But I do not want Hon. Members of this House, or the people of Canada, to be misled by its shortness into believing that Bill C-21 is insignificant, because this Bill packs an immense wallop. It has enough of a wallop to bankrupt most of the small businesses of this country when the rippling effect is finally felt throughout the system in high interest rates and inflation. It has a wallop big enough to destroy the middle class in this country when the rippling effect of inflation and high interest rates is felt, and that is bound to occur when this Bill hits the money markets. I tell you, Sir, that no one in Canada should ignore this "small" Bill because we and our children are going to be living with it for a long time.

This Bill provides to Canadians, to this House, the philosophy of the Liberal Party starting from 1968 when this Government came into power. The Liberal philosophy is reflected in this borrowing Bill because its philosophy is to overspend—overspend yesterday, overspend today and overspend tomorrow.

What do I mean by overspending? My definition of spending is when government taxes people and uses that money for the operation of government. Overspending is when government does not have any money and spends anyway and must borrow outside the country. That is the Liberal Government philosophy—overspending. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it has been so successful in that philosophy it has out-NDP'ed the NDP. That poor Party has no place to go now because the Liberals have taken over its socialist position of heavy spending.

This Government's spending since 1968 is well detailed as a percentage of the Gross National Product, and I would like to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that this is on a national accounts basis. My figures do not seem to agree with some of the other figures which have been bandied about, particularly by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) who spoke for the New Democratic Party. We had a lot of humbug from Humboldt. My figures show, and I believe these are accurate figures, that in 1968-1969 we were spending 17.4 per cent of the Gross National Product. That figure has increased steadily. The only time it showed a decrease was during the period when the Conservatives were in power. That was in 1979-1980, I believe, and the figure decreased by one percentage point that one year. In the previous year government spent 21.3 per cent of the Gross National Product. The following year when the Conservatives were in power, it was 20.7 per cent. The year after when the Liberals again became the Government, spending went up to 21.2 per cent, and today it is 25 per cent. Spending is going up, up, up, and there is no indication it will go down.

That is an example of the Liberal Government's philosophy. We have a Budget of \$100 billion. We have an annual deficit of \$30 billion. We have a total deficit of some \$180 billion at

Borrowing Authority Act

the end of this year. Not very many people can comprehend \$180 billion. However, I believe everyone can comprehend \$6,000 to \$7,000 a year, and that is the debt which every child born today is burdened with. That is our children's heritage because of the overspending of the Liberal Government over the past number of years. The minute a child is brought into this world he or she owes a debt of \$7,000. How it is going to be paid is really a good question.

What has concerned me, and I believe what concerns a lot of Canadians, is how can anyone spend so much money? How can one overspend to the extent of \$30 billion a year? We have been provided with some very good examples and I do not intend to go into all of them, but I would like to mention a few which the average Canadian can understand. However, first of all, I would like to tell the average Canadian that the deficit of \$30 billion is probably not an exact figure. I will quote what the Auditor General said in his report about that deficit:

The increase in the national debt is important to all Canadians. Parliamentarians have the need—and all Canadians the right—to know the actual deficit, the actual debt as precisely as can be stated.

He continues, and this is the important part:

My opinion on the Financial Statements of the Government of Canada illustrates that those amounts would differ by many billions of dollars from what is presented—

That is the \$30 billion figure. So we are not even getting the facts on this horrendous \$30 billion annual deficit. As I was saying, how do you overspend that kind of money, Mr. Speaker? Well, let us go to something Canadians can understand, the Auditor General's report. He talks about a horror story in New Brunswick involving the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. It guaranteed a loan for some \$315,000 to build a 22-unit hotel. The motel did not make its payments. The trust company seized the hotel and sold it. But did they do it properly? Not at all. A corporate guarantee by the same hotel owner was never pursued by the Government. The Government failed to ensure that a protective bid was placed at the auction, nor was it even represented at the auction to ensure the proceedings were conducted in the best interests of the Crown. What happened at the auction? We sold the motel for \$200. The successful bidder, and I will guarantee you he was a Liberal, sold the property the next day for \$75,200. A nice day's profit. The fellow who brought it mortgaged it a month later for \$285,000.

• (1700)

That is how this Government overspends. It gives money away, throws it away. You may say \$315,000 is not a lot, and perhaps not. But it is a lot of money to me and my constituents in the Okanagan where we have 20 per cent unemployment. We can use that kind of money. All I am saying is that that sort of thing is repeated time and time again, and how do you explain it?

What about Centennial Towers here in Ottawa which we were talking about the other day? The Department of Public Works wanted a building so they put out bids and got 32 proposals. Number 24 on the list was the so-called Centennial Towers. Not the second, third, fourth, fifth, tenth or fifteenth