

Borrowing Authority

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) may make queries about his questions, but not debate the matter.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I would not want that comment to pass. The defeated NDP candidates do not want a place at the trough beside the Liberals and the Tories.

Mr. Blenkarn: Madam Speaker, question No. 1,653 in the name of the Hon. Member for High Park concerns the way the Government has been handling refugees from the Ukraine, the Soviet Union, Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany. I am surprised that that question has not been answered, and that the Hon. Member has not made sure that the Government gave the kind of answer it should, particularly when he himself is so interested in people who are badly treated in Communist countries.

Mr. Flis: First, Madam Speaker, I think the Hon. Member should get his facts straight. There is no such Member in this House as the Hon. Member for High Park.

Mr. Blenkarn: He does not represent High Park; he only represents Parkdale.

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1982-83 (NO. 3)

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-143, to provide supplementary borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Skelly (p. 22957).

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, just prior to the luncheon adjournment I was discussing this Bill along the lines of the lack of accountability in Government in terms of its methods of spending. I had mentioned one corporation about which the people in my area of Saskatchewan—and as a matter of fact all people in western Canada—are very concerned, that is, Canadian National Railways.

I wish to put on the record that in addition to the funds CNR is presently seeking, in 1977 it was given a recapitalization and a debt forgiveness of \$808 million. Members of the House and the people of Canada were told at that time that it would allow CN to carry on in a very orderly manner, the

same as any other corporation, and not to continue to come to the Government for assistance.

While we are speaking of expenditures of money, I was interested in the reply given today to a question asked by the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher) in which a considerable sum of money was mentioned. I am sure that if we check *Hansard*, we would see that the Hon. Member for Mississauga North requested that judicial inquiry. My understanding as an ordinary member of the Canadian society is that a judicial inquiry in the courts of Canada should be more difficult than one where a member of the bar travels around the country, visits and makes up his own ideas three years after the fact, as Mr. Macdonald will do to report on the economy as it is today, three years after the fact. There is not much consistency in the answer given about the expenditure of Government funds. I am not familiar with all the gentlemen and law firms named in the answer regarding the Mississauga rail disaster inquiry, but I do not think I heard one ex-Cabinet Minister's name mentioned. This is the difference between the Government allowing \$850 per day to an ex-Liberal Cabinet Minister such as Mr. Macdonald, and a reputable law firm acting in a court of law of Canada. I just draw that to the attention of the House.

As we look at our deficit and the request of the Government for an additional \$19 billion in borrowing authority, there is no reason that Canadians should have much faith in anything the Government puts out, especially regarding projections as to cash flow and cash requirements. I should like to turn to November 1981 when the then Minister of Finance said that the budget deficit would be \$10.5 billion for 1982-83. Just seven months after that, in June 1982, the same Minister had to go back on his previous forecast. At that time he said the deficit would be \$19.6 billion, and then just four months thereafter, in October 1982, the same Minister of Finance showed Canadians just how out of whack his forecast was. At that time he told us that the budget deficit would be \$23.6 billion. Then, four months thereafter, in February 1983, the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) indicated that the current forecast of debt would be \$27 billion. We started out at \$10.5 billion in 1982-83; then we went to \$19.6 billion; then to \$23.6 billion; now we come to \$27 billion.

An Hon. Member: That is more than six and five.

Mr. McKnight: As one of my colleagues says, that is considerably more than "six and five". If we are really to believe that the increase the Government is forecasting for expenditures in the coming year is only 9 per cent, we must start with the premise that its numbers are correct this time. But if we go with the premise that the first numbers we were given for 1982-83 were correct, we see an increase of 17 per cent in Government spending this year. The people of Canada cannot understand why the Government would come to the House of Commons and ask for approval of basically a loan or a garnishee on the people of Canada for an additional \$19