

as much as the people of Canada are going to save this year. In the first quarter of the fiscal year there is a large drain on the federal Treasury. There is need for new funds. One reason for this is tax refunds, which will probably amount to about \$3.8 billion this year. The Government now wants to borrow to pay the money to the taxpayers of Canada who have been paying in for 12 or 15 months. They have been paying that money to the Government of Canada, trusting that the Government will have the money to pay it back. It does not have it. It has spent it. The Government has blown it on things like Canadair and de Havilland.

In 1968, our debt was about 2 per cent of the Gross National Product. Now it is about 4.7 per cent. In 1968, when you and I were paying taxes, Mr. Speaker, it took \$1 out of \$9 to pay the interest on the debt which the Government had incurred on behalf of Canadians. Now it takes \$1 out of every \$3 for which Canadian men and women work to pay the interest on the debt which has been incurred.

I would like to look at promises which have been made in the past, Mr. Speaker. I recall that in campaigning the Government said it would keep its 1980 election promise to hold spending growth below the rate of GNP and to reduce steadily the size of the deficit. The Government made that promise in 1980 along with a lot of other promises.

Let us look at how well this promise has been kept. In the 1980-81 national accounts spending was 15.4 per cent. Public accounts spending was 15.2 per cent. The nominal GNP was 13.9 and the inflation rate on the CPI was 10.2 per cent. In 1981-82, the spending increase on national accounts was 19.6 per cent, public accounts spending was 16.7 per cent. The nominal GNP was 14.3 per cent and the inflation rate on the CPI was 12.5 per cent. In 1982-83, there was an 18 per cent increase in national accounts and a 17.9 per cent increase on public accounts. The nominal GNP was 5.2 per cent and the inflation rate on the CPI was 10.8 per cent. It goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

The Government said it was not going to spend beyond the GNP or increase spending. We just had a Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. At the longest this Parliament will last 12 months. It may last six or seven months. In the Throne Speech there were 24 promises for new spending. There were 28 promises for new legislation, which I am sure will incur spending. There were 26 promises to set up task forces and engage in consultation or create new bodies or boards, which are going to cost money, Mr. Speaker. There were 20 other promises of Government action. These are all direct initiatives which the Government is going to put forward in six to eight months. This is more legislation than the Government has put forward since 1980.

The Government is asking for \$29.55 billion. The amount of \$15 billion would carry the Government through until the end of August. Parliament will be sitting at that time. If the Government needs more money, then it could come before Parliament to say it has spent its money and what it has spent it on. If it feels that some deserving programs should be funded and it does not have the capital to do it, it could ask to borrow more money. Part of the more than \$29 billion is contingency.

Borrowing Authority Act

It is a \$4 billion slush fund, according to the Government's own accounts. It can run the next fiscal year with \$25 billion, but it wants \$4 billion to play with. Maybe the Minister of Finance likes to have some change in his pocket. That is a lot of change to leave at the discretion of these people.

If the money were going to be used to re-establish VIA Rail, it may be acceptable. However, it is not. We have heard the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) talking about new cars servicing certain parts of Canada under the VIA Rail Act. He tells us they will be there in 1986 or 1987. However, the President of VIA Rail says it may be by 1989 and more likely in 1990. So this money is not going to go to that.

The whole point of the matter is that the borrowing authority for which the Government is asking is beyond reason in the minds of all Canadians. It wants \$4 billion for discretionary spending but the balance of the money is not being spent to employ Canadians, return investment, build growth in our country, lower our inflation rate or put 1.5 million Canadians back to work.

I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that other Members will speak against this Bill and vote against it when the time comes.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, it would appear that Bill C-21 is intended to put Canada's economic remains in the vault. We are going to take the whole \$29 billion that we are going to need now. We are not going to take a second bit of this cherry. We do not want to remind Canada again how much we are borrowing. We will take it all now and put Canada's economic remains in the vault. We do not want to exhume the body for any purpose whatsoever, not even for its proper burial.

I like some of the things which were said about this Budget. Of course, the Budget is the cause for Bill C-21. I like particularly some of the sources from which they came. I like the idea that was expressed on CBC TV that if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) is correct in his economic predictions, then a lot of other economic seers would have to be wrong. I think the Minister of Finance is wrong. I also like what Barbara Frum said. She said that the Budget appears to be speaking directly to the NDP constituencies. I know the NDP members would contradict that statement. They would have gone even further and the vault would have had to be bigger. Nevertheless, that came from just a casual observer who has been somewhat more than favourable to the NDP over the years. I also like what Peter Newman said about the Budget. He said it is a mugwump Budget, meaning someone who sits firmly on the fence.

• (1630)

Let me be more serious. I am concerned about what Premier Lee from P.E.I. had to say about it. The Island Premier says that even though the federal Budget contains a few tidbits of good news, like pension increases and tax adjustments for farmers and small business, he is disappointed that there was not more substance in the federal financial projection. He