

Time Allocation

before. I wonder if the Hon. Member has brought this to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please.

[Translation]

Mr. Duclos: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Montmorency-Orléans (Mr. Duclos) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Duclos: I should like to mention to my hon. friend in the Official Opposition that many observers expected the deficit to reach \$30 billion. I have never said that the government's deficit would amount to \$30 billion. I think the record should be set straight.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, that is debate. The Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm).

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, I would be really surprised that a Member of the Government would refer to an estimate of \$30 billion as having any authenticity whatsoever if there were not some justification in his mind that it is possible. He went on to say that this is a weakness in our argument when we are supposed to have known this for some time. I would remind all Hon. Members of the Government that it is not so long since the Government was talking about \$10.5 billion. If it thinks that we in Opposition are the only people in Canada concerned about a possible \$30 billion deficit without seeing a budget to justify not only the \$5 billion it is asking for but an additional \$14 billion today, then it is sadly mistaken.

The people of Canada are opposed to the likelihood of a deficit of \$30 billion. It is not we who will have to pay back that debt, but our children and our grandchildren and our great grandchildren. They will have to pay back a deficit that is beyond the control of Members on this side of the House because the Government resorts to closure, to limiting debate, in order to borrow money without the necessary information to justify it. I challenge the next speaker to tell the Members on this side what business in the country could run its affairs the way the Government thinks it can run the nation.

The Minister of Finance is on record as saying there would be a new budget before more borrowing authority was sought. As reported in *Hansard* for October 27, 1982, he said:

In the budget I intend to present early in 1983, I will review again the fiscal situation for the current fiscal year, set out estimates for 1983-84 and future fiscal years, and then seek additional borrowing authority as required.

At the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on May 31, 1982, the former Minister of Finance, now the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen), had this to say:

I do not think it would be appropriate to ask the House for additional borrowing authority until I have laid out in some detail an update of both the economic situation and the fiscal situation.

Surely the Government today does not treat lightly the borrowing of these billions of dollars without giving the Opposition the opportunity to examine a fiscal policy that would justify such expenditures. It is not satisfactory just to

table the Main Estimates in the House because, by themselves, they are insufficient evidence of the need for additional funds. In Supplementary Estimates C there are some things that disturb the people of the country and that require more explanation. Is the pit bottomless, Mr. Speaker? Is it the understanding of the Government that for as long as it is in office it intends to come back here because it has a majority, bring in the requirements for more moneys, give them two, three or seven days of debate, never present a financial budget in the House, and expect us to accept willingly the estimates for additional funds to cover additional deficits which have never been explained in detail to Members of the House of Commons? It is totally irresponsible, it is unacceptable. I am absolutely amazed that the Government Member who just spoke would treat the matter lightly and make statements about the "weakness" of our arguments as we object to an additional \$19 billion, \$14 billion or \$5 billion, as required by the Government, without bringing in a budget.

• (1610)

If Hon. Members opposite would like some horrendous nightmare stories such as the ones documented in the House over the period of many months and years concerning inappropriate spending of Government, I am prepared to give some examples which, with all due respect to the Government, it cannot really justify.

An Hon. Member: Let us hear a few.

Mr. Domm: All right, I will give the Hon. Member some and see what he thinks about them. When we talk about taxis and about taking the people of Canada for a ride in its request for funds, let me indicate that between March 1, 1980 and May 31, 1981, the Government paid out \$3.5 million in taxi fares. The largest single bill from any Government Department was perhaps appropriately from Transport Canada for \$422,000 worth of taxi bills. At current Ottawa taxi rates of \$1.20 per mile, this is enough to go around the world 120 times. With no effort to control that growing budget, they come back here and ask for \$19 billion.

Let us talk about telegrams for a minute. Between March 1980 and June 1981, the Government spent \$16.7 million on telegrams, cables and other wireless communications. Even Canada Post does not trust its own mail, as it spent \$260,000 in that period of time on telegrams.

What about hospitality? I do not know whether they are celebrating the appointment of a new Finance Minister or the appointment of a Minister in another Department who is as irresponsible as the Minister of Finance, but let us refer to the Government's treatment of hospitality. In fiscal year 1981-82, 11 Government Departments spent a total of \$10.4 million on hospitality, food, booze, and authority for it, as required, was given.

If the Hon. Member opposite think that these kinds of requirements are justification for a budget, that it has seeded