

Government would have to put out by way of Unemployment Insurance and social security measures in picking up living expenses of those people whose Unemployment Insurance benefits had run out, would likely result in a deficit of around \$28 billion to \$30 billion at the end of the fiscal year on March 31.

In the Finance Minister's statement made two weeks after Parliament resumed, he estimated the deficit would be somewhat less than \$28 billion. But with the Estimates we now have we find the deficit will be in that ball park.

The principle generally conceded to be in effect when it comes to managing money in the parliamentary system has always been that, first, the Government will lay down a Speech from the Throne, followed by a budget containing the economic forecast for the country as well as the expenditures and methods by which the Government will raise the required funds, either through taxation or other means. Then as the parliamentary session proceeds we get to the estimates of each department. Committees examine them. However, that procedure is being by-passed with the kind of borrowing authority that is being asked for today. Something like \$5 billion is being asked for today to complete this fiscal year. But a new precedent is being set by the Government in asking for an additional \$14 billion for the fiscal year to start April 1. This is almost as much as the accumulated borrowing authority requested for last year in the first six months. We were asked in June, 1982 for \$6.6 billion, in July, 1982 for \$7 billion, and in November, 1982 for an additional \$4 billion for a total of \$17.6 billion. Today we are being asked for an additional \$5 billion to finish out the year.

What the Government appears to be doing is arranging to borrow for one whole year's expenditures prior to the beginning of a year. We are not guaranteed \$17 billion will carry the Government through the year. This is simply an interim payment, so to speak. The Government may, in fact, be back before Parliament three or four times for additional borrowing as it did during this fiscal year.

It is right for this Parliament to stand on its ancient traditions so as to find out on what these moneys will be expended. We are right to hold up passage of this Bill until it is referred to a committee, as is the intent of this amendment with which we are dealing at the moment. Questions can be asked in committee and hopefully explanations will be given. Without that kind of question and answer session we get into a great many expenditures that are unplanned, are not monitored by the Parliament of the country, and do not have the sanction of this Parliament.

I have one example I wish to outline. It is a very small amount of money in comparison to \$17 billion, \$28 billion or even the cumulative budget of somewhere between \$150 billion to \$160 billion. Nevertheless, this example of mine outlines a principle which is being ignored. The matter came up in the House last week. I questioned the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) about the advertising he was doing in Quebec concerning the Crow proposal. I attempted to point out that the expenditures of those full-page ads had not received any authority from this House. The suggestion that advertising

would be done to explain the Government's position on the Crow rate has never been presented in any of the Estimates. It was not mentioned in the budget nor directly in the Speech from the Throne. What is the Minister doing spending money on advertising the Crow rate proposal? Through his own admission, we found that he was prepared to spend \$350,000. As reported in *Hansard* for February 22, 1983, he said:

—and we are estimating that the total ad program will probably cost around \$350,000.

When I asked him where he was getting the money, he replied:

Madam Speaker, the funds we are using are funds from my Department and several other departments that are available for communications.

The Minister's reasoning for this advertising was that some of the provinces, specifically the Province of Quebec, were doing so.

I decided to check to see whether the parliamentary process in the Provinces had completely fallen down also. I phoned the Ministry of Agriculture for the Province of Quebec and I found out that indeed the Province of Quebec had allocated some funds to explain the Gilson proposal. Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Transport in the Province of Quebec had each allocated \$5,000 for advertising. Some of those funds had been made available to a coalition set up by the various farm groups that will be affected by the Crow proposal. They had used some of that money for advertising. As far as they knew the total advertising expenditure was \$6,103. It was to advertise meetings on the subject.

Mr. Miller: A pittance compared to the federal Government's amount.

Mr. Althouse: The federal Government needs \$350,000 to counteract provincial advertising. The Minister of Agriculture told me that movies, slide shows and all kinds of media hype were being produced by the Provinces. I checked that out as well and found that the Province of Quebec has a slide tape show to explain the Gilson proposal, copies of which are distributed to agricultural experts in various regions of the Province. The Province spent \$1,000 on those. These slide tape shows are now being updated, and the Province may spend as much as an additional \$5,000 from the authorization fund of the Department of Transport. Thirteen copies are to be produced. If any Hon. Member is interested, a copy will be available at the Buckingham office, which is the closest one to Ottawa.

Parliamentary principles were adhered to in the Province of Quebec. The expenditure was put forward in that Province's Estimates and the funds were expended under the Estimates as passed.

However, in contrast to that, \$350,000 is being expended by the federal Government to explain a policy which has never been formally introduced in this House nor has it ever been presented in the form of a Bill. It is a policy which has no authority to have money expended on it to explain it to the people of Canada. There is the difference. My example is only a small one but in the ten minutes allocated to me today I