

Borrowing Authority Act

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, when asking this question, I would like to assure my hon. friend that I did not know what he was going to say in his remarks. If I threw him off the rails, as it appears I did from some of the things he said, I apologize for it. It was not intentional.

I would like to know from my hon. friend if I can take it from what he said about federal Government projects in Winnipeg that he and his Party oppose those projects and are saying to the people of Winnipeg, a city which, as I recall, contains more than half the population of the province, that if they had formed the government, they would not have started those projects there. If that is the case, I think that should be on the record.

As well, I would like to ask my hon. friend if he realizes that he made some very erroneous statements about the Hilton Hotel project in Windsor. The federal support through ILAP of not \$9 million but \$6 million was in the form of a repayable loan and was approved and not rejected by the enterprise development program. Does he not realize that that same project received substantial financial support of over \$1 million from the Ontario Conservative Government? That Government was so pleased with that project that not only did it provide support but it sent a member of the legislature who belonged to that Party to the opening ceremonies a few weeks ago in order to take credit for its contribution to the support of that project. Can I take it that the Hon. Member's Party is saying to the people of Windsor that it does not think that that project should have taken place there?

Finally, I would like to ask my hon. friend why, if he says that government spending is the main problem, his Leader is calling for more money to be spent on defence, amounts that would be in the billions? Why is his Party calling for more spending to deal with the alleged under-funding of hospitals? Why is his Party calling for more spending to deal with what his Party describes as the need for more funds for research and development? These objectives are all worthy ones but require substantial amounts of money. My hon. friend, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Minister—

Mr. Gray: May I finish my sentence, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Minister has put a question, made a comment and put other questions. In the previous round of questions and comments, Hon. members must have noticed that we only managed to hear from two Hon. Members. The Permanent and Provisional Standing Orders require that questions, comments and responses be brief and to the point. I must ask Hon. Members to abide by the rules. I will now recognize the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington).

Mr. Huntington: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly apologize to the President of the Treasury Board, who is the former Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, for saying that \$9 million went to the hotel project in Windsor. I know that that figure should have been \$6 million. I deliberately said \$9

million because I thought that might at least get him on his feet. This is the first time he has been on his feet regarding that issue since it was raised in the House of Commons.

The fact is that it is the type of spending that I am questioning. I am sure that I could look at the files in my office and find out that the application for that hotel was originally rejected by the Enterprise Development Board and that a ministerial imposition brought it back and put it through the system. Is spending on low interest rate loans or forgivable loans the right way to spend money, particularly when it is spent in the Minister's riding? Does the Hilton Hotel need that kind of aid or should that aid go to permanent projects?

The Minister might reply by saying that he opened the dockyard in my riding which the Liberals had talked about since 1974 and which I began when I was a Minister. In six months of governing, we go that dockyard started. That is a project that is creating work on a permanent basis for the shipyard industry in that terminal port of Canada.

It is the classification of spending and the use to which we put the tax dollar that is so important. Spending money on advertising and on interest-free loans to hotels which apparently cannot stand on their own feet is not the type of spending and aid that we need. It is a classic example of the political abuse of the system and of the protections that are built into the system.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Member just spoke about his use of the \$9 million and \$6 million figures, I could not help but be reminded of his comments regarding Mr. Huff's book, *How to Lie with Statistics*. However, I will not pursue that.

Mr. Huntington: Yes, pursue it. I used it on purpose.

Mr. Riis: In other words, he manipulated the discussion by misleading us with statistics.

I listened very carefully to the Hon. Member's presentation and I know that he is serious when making his various allegations. I believe he believes in what he is saying. I would like to ask the Hon. Member to do me a favour by being precise when he refers to the need to reduce the benefit. The Hon. Member used Mrs. Thatcher and how she was able to reduce spending in that government as an example, of reducing the deficit. Perhaps the Hon. Member could provide us with two or three specific examples of areas of government spending in which he feels cuts should be made or spending reduced in some form or another. I do not think it is unrealistic to ask that. I know that when the Hon. Member was a member of government, he was concerned about ways to cut back. I would ask him to be as precise as possible when describing the areas in which cutbacks could occur.

Mr. Huntington: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would go back and re-examine on a zero budgeting base all of the existing programs that we have had in place from day one that have experienced nothing but inflationary incremental increases. I