

grips with the size of these deficits. We must face them head on. Yet I hear not one single word from the Liberal Party or the Liberal leadership candidates today about the most serious problem that faces the economic future of this country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. gentleman but his 10 minutes are up.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on one of the comments made by the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson) who preceded me. Managing a government is really no different from managing your home or your own personal business. Here on the Hill we often lose sight of the fact that if one continues year after year to spend more than one takes in, sooner or later someone catches up with them. We are debating the necessity or lack of necessity of borrowing \$29.5 billion. As I pointed out earlier, that is more than the total fiscal planning and financial forecasts of the present Government. In other words, the Government is looking for a slush fund of \$4 billion, far beyond what is required to run the current operating costs of the Government.

We have reason to be suspicious of slush funds. On numerous occasions in the House we have pointed out some of the uses these extra funds are put to. It is sad and I regret to report that when there is a requirement to borrow \$29.5 billion in order to continue the Government's business it means that for every dollar of revenue the Government takes in it is planning to spend \$1.50. You cannot run your home, your own personal business or a country that way. The dollar ends up being devalued. Inflation goes up because it costs more dollars to buy the same imported goods. The net result of all this added inflation is added unemployment. Since the number one issue in Canada today is getting more people back to work, it is counter-productive to spend more money than we have, thus driving up inflation and devaluing our dollar. They all go hand in hand with a forecast which is rather gloomy for the 1.5 million people who are presently unemployed and falls short of what they might expect from the Government. They would expect the Government to manage its own affairs better.

To drive the point home, you sometimes have to use what seems on the surface to be a rather ridiculous example. I am going to use butter as an example. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) has left the House. He will probably be back. The Minister responsible for agriculture in the country has allowed something to happen which should never have happened. The Minister responsible for foreign affairs has also allowed something to happen which should never have happened. In other words, our Government is condoning the illegal importation of agricultural products. Not only is it bringing in products which are not approved, but they do not fall under the Official Languages Act. They are imported with French only on the wrapper. They are sold in downtown Toronto.

A Mr. Herbst in downtown Toronto was fined \$4,000 when he tried to sell a four-ounce chocolate bar that did not have metric on the wrapper. To appeal the case would cost him in

Borrowing Authority Act

the neighbourhood of \$20,000 which he cannot raise. Consequently, he cannot appeal. That is what the Government will do to a small, independent retailer who is trying to sell a four-ounce chocolate bar which does not have French on it, or metric.

I wonder what the Government would do to the foreign affairs officials who allowed the purchase of butter with a French only wrapper. That has been proven in the courts to be illegal. Do we have two systems of rules and regulations? Do we allow French only material to come into the country? Do we not prosecute the people who use, purchase and sell them?

Mr. Pepin: Yes.

Mr. Domm: What civil servant is being prosecuted for purchasing French only butter?

Mr. Pepin: The importer.

Mr. Domm: The importer? The Minister mentions the importer as being prosecuted. What about the official, who is on a salary as well, who buys illegally imported product? Why is he not in court? What happened to the chef at the embassy—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. The Chair has some difficulty relating the Hon. Member's remarks to Bill C-21 which is under discussion at this time. May I ask the Hon. Member to try to get back on the subject.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-21 calls for a \$4 billion slush fund to allow the present Government to continue to waste money. I am trying to give an example of where some of that money is going. This morning's *Ottawa Citizen* reports that it costs \$500,000 a year to run the ninth floor Pearson Building dining room which is using illegally imported French butter. It is reported they are paying as much as \$10 a pound. Some of the \$4 billion slush fund is being spent to sustain a restaurant. We have enough trouble selling products from our own agricultural community today without importing French butter illegally and then having it sold in one of our Government ministry restaurants. This is not the Parliamentary Restaurant which we as Members of Parliament are responsible for, but the restaurant at the foreign embassy which is under the ministry of foreign affairs. They are wasting Canadian taxpayers' money and are not spending the money locally buying Canadian agricultural products. The chef says the reason he buys it for that restaurant is that it is the best. It is brought illegally into Canada and should not be purchased by any Minister. It should not be the Herbsts, the small independent dealers in Toronto, who are prosecuted for selling English only chocolate bars. We have a ministry here which imports French only butter.

I was flying on Air Canada the other day and had some wine. I noticed that the labels were all in French only. We are importing and paying more for that wine than we would for domestic wine. Yet the Air Canada people are serving it. I believe that needs investigation as well.