

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, I want to follow, just for a minute, the sterling comments made by my friend and just point out to my colleague from Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) that if he would take note of the number of private members' bills that have been tabled in the House and talked out by the Government, rather than the Opposition, then he would not be so concerned about the issue. And if, as he suggests, it will be talked out by the Government, then maybe there is a signal going out across the country today that Government backbenchers find even greater barriers in talking to their colleagues on the Liberal side, and if the Government has difficulty talking to people across the country, that same phenomenon is happening within the Liberal caucus. If he wants to get the bill passed, all he has to do is talk to his Minister and get it negotiated before it is tabled in the House.

Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am delighted to participate in this debate this afternoon. As you well know, when the Canada Assistance Plan was passed in 1966, it replaced four federal-provincial programs which had been directed toward special target groups, the elderly, the blind, the disabled and the unemployed. At the time of its introduction, CAP was progressive legislation because it was based on the premise of providing assistance to all persons in financial need, regardless of the cause of that need.

Under CAP, a federal government shares in the cost of provincial and municipal social assistance payments as well as certain social service programs which are referred to in the act as welfare services. To be eligible for cost sharing, social assistance programs must meet, as you all know, three conditions. They must utilize needs testing, they must have an appeal system, and they must not impose residence requirements. The beneficiaries of the social assistance programs funded under CAP are those who have insufficient income to meet their basic needs. A large proportion of beneficiaries are disabled.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The hour provided for consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At 6 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8.00 p.m.

Supplementary Borrowing Authority

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1982-83 (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Cosgrove (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-128, to provide supplementary borrowing authority (No. 2) be read the second time and be referred to Committee of the Whole.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): When the debate was interrupted at five o'clock the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney) had the floor.

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, when I began this speech this afternoon I discussed the shocking rise in government expenditures and in the deficit which has more than doubled in the last 11 months to \$23.6 billion, according to the estimates of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). I spoke about the size of the public debt which, at \$134 billion in my province, exceeds the average family income on an annual basis.

I discussed how we had forced the Government to reduce its original borrowing bill from \$11 billion to \$7 billion and why we are having this debate on the additional \$4 billion, in order to establish accountability to the taxpayers who put up the money. At five o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing the Prime Minister's reaction.

Yesterday the Minister of Finance rose in the House to present a budget masquerading as a financial statement. He told us of his Government's new principles of economic management. His Government has discovered the benefits of fiscal responsibility on the eve of asking Parliament for an additional \$4 billion borrowing authority. His Government has also concluded, he says, that our economic dynamism stems from the health of the private sector. To encourage growth in the private sector, the Minister intends to consult with business and labour and to provide an atmosphere of certainty and stability. This comment, Mr. Speaker, comes from the Minister who was responsible for the National Energy Program which was so destructive of trust, so destructive of the private sector, and certainly was destructive of stability.

Last night in his statement, the Minister made it clear that he could find no ways of financing his job-creation programs other than by increasing unemployment insurance premiums and in some re-allocation of existing funds. He has repeatedly rejected our Party's suggestion of an all-party committee which would review programs and suggest possible reductions in expenditures.

Let me identify some areas of spending in the past. These are drawn from the annual reports of the Auditor General, Order Paper Questions and estimates.

One is the area of cost over-runs. Shortly after becoming President of the Treasury Board in the Clark Government in