

—the hon. member knows the government's position on atomic weapons of any kind and we have stated that we would not use them and they would not be deployed on our soil.

That is a fairly simple statement, Mr. Speaker:

—we would not use them and they would not be deployed on our soil.

The only problem is that it is untrue. That remark would clearly leave the impression that we do not have any atomic weapons of any kind on our soil.

I managed to get in a supplementary question a little later that same day. I asked the Prime Minister:

Does this mean that nuclear weapons have been removed from Comox, where they have been on our soil for over a decade?

Listen carefully to the Prime Minister's answer, which follows:

Madam Speaker, I thought the policy was made clear when we were discussing F-18. The F-18 will be the new fighter aircraft in Canada, and it is not designed to carry nuclear weapons.

This does not answer the question, Mr. Speaker. It leaves the House still in its deceived state that there are no atomic weapons on our soil. As a result of that, I had to ask another question, which was:

Is he now informing the House, or did he, a few minutes ago, that the nuclear weapons which are on site in Comox at the present time have been removed?

The answer finally came from the Prime Minister:

We have stated repeatedly that our policy is to remove the nuclear weapons, but until the F-18 is in place they will not be removed.

This is the kind of cheap, sleazy little trick that gives this place a bad name.

A great many people who did not see the House on television before, are seeing it now. They did not know what was going on. They are puzzled by this lack of ability to give a straight answer. Why not give a straight answer? Eventually it comes out. I think there is an advantage to the government in not giving a straight answer, in that it usually requires another question and one uses up the allotted time. It is rather like a football team trying to maintain possession when they are one point ahead, by using up time. Sometimes I think that is why this government loves to give so many deceptive answers.

I would like to mention another item with respect to this issue which rather concerns me because it happened with what had been up until now a fairly good minister, in terms of replying to questions. I asked the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais) on February 5, 1981, just six days ago, about the F-18 fighter contract, which is a matter of great concern in this country for a variety of reasons. One of the reasons is that there is a strong suspicion that McDonnell Douglas are not fulfilling the terms of the contract. The contract said they would provide \$83 million worth of new work in 1980 and also in 1981. These were calendar years. When I asked the Minister of Supply and Services if they had fulfilled it he said:

—I am not in a position to advise the hon. gentleman if the specific commitment relating to the KC-10 and the DC-10 in terms of the time frame envisaged by Milestone 6 would entitle the full payment at that particular time. I will review the question of whether the payment has been made, and advise the hon. gentleman.

Borrowing Authority

This matter is really of concern to me since here is a minister who is in charge of that contract. It is his responsibility to oversee it. It is a contract that runs into billions of dollars. McDonnell Douglas were supposed to supply \$83 million of new work. Everybody in the area of the plant in Toronto is unhappy about the lay-offs which have occurred there. We have had paraders on the hill, yet the minister says he does not know whether they have fulfilled their obligation, whether they have paid the money or what they have done. In that same response the minister goes on to say:

I will advise him as well about the conditions that were met. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, to the best of my knowledge, the payments that have been made are in accordance with the terms of the contract—

That reply was given six days ago. The last time I asked this question was three months ago. These milestones seem to come up about every three months. When I asked the question three months ago the minister was back within the hour. Six days have now elapsed and he is not back with an answer this time. Of course, that makes me suspicious that there is something even worse going on with that contract than we had thought up until now.

I rather enjoyed the talk from the member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) and with respect to Bill C-59 and the German marks. I have one of those bills from 1923 which illustrated inflation. I picked it up in Germany in 1946. I believe it was a note for 10 billion marks. Of course it was worthless. Before us we have one of the smallest bills imaginable. It is reputed to have four clauses, but there are really only two main paragraphs in it—actually only one, given the short title which reads:

This act may be cited as the borrowing authority act, 1981-82.

Then there is the clause with respect to borrowing authority. Then tucked away at about line 15 are the words "such sum or sums of money, not exceeding in the whole, fourteen billion dollars, as may be required for public works and general purposes." This bill does not get very particular about anything else. It just says that whenever the cabinet needs it they can borrow \$14 billion. That is a terrible amount of money.

● (1750)

It would be interesting to compare the amount of money the government is asking to borrow with the number of words in the bill. This very short bill enables the cabinet to borrow \$14 billion, although it takes only one column of a page and five lines on another page. The last bill with which we dealt from the Department of Finance was Bill C-54, "An act to amend the statute law relating to income tax". The bill consisted of 225 pages and has the purpose of closing loopholes which taxpayers might use to avoid paying their taxes. It takes 225 pages for the government to close these loopholes, but it only takes two paragraphs on one page to borrow \$14 billion. It is no wonder it has taken the borrowing route.

What is the government doing with this money? I do not suppose any of it will go directly to the purchase of Petrofina by Petro-Canada because I understand the financing for that project will come from an increase in the price of gasoline, fuel