

Borrowing Authority

Public Works, and on his third draw he submitted documentation to prove his eligibility for a progress draw of \$290,000. He was told by the officials of the Department of Public Works, with whom he had contracted, that they had miscalculated the worth of this particular firm, the ability of the firm to perform, and they felt that he could only put \$90,000 worth of goods and services into that building, and they had budgeted for that. So all he was going to get was \$90,000. Where was the other \$200,000 to come from? There was a solution to that. What he was told to do was to lay his men off and they would go on UIC, or they could have some grandiose project where they could go out and rake leaves in the forest until some time after April 1 when there was a new budget and new buckets of money and he could be paid the balance. Over and above that, the Department officials said that they would pay him the interest on that \$200,000 because they were incapable of paying the full amount at that time.

When situations like that are allowed to occur, how on earth can any Government balance its budget? How on earth can any Canadian expect to have any confidence in what its Government is doing? Situations like that are occurring every day. To save a few bucks, why do we not turn the heat down in this place? Everybody is cooking. I think it is mostly from the alternate sources of energy from the front benches opposite, but the fact remains that wherever we look, we see waste.

A few years ago the then Auditor General, J. J. Macdonell, provided concrete evidence to support his claim that Government spending and fiscal accountability were out of control. Over the years, the Liberal Government has been speeding down the road toward ever-increasing Government spending and waste. It did not, however, realize how fast it was going, and ever since it hit that deadly curve, "the recession curve", it has been spinning out of control.

As the Official Opposition, we do not take objection to the fact that the Government needs money. Of course it does. What we do take exception to is the fact that the Government cannot tell us exactly how much it needs and what it needs the money for. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason we stand here in such frustration and try to impress on the Members opposite that they have a responsibility to their own constituents and they have a responsibility to Canada. Those good men and women across there have the same responsibility to the people in Prince George as I, the elected Member, does. They do not accept that responsibility. Regardless of how rotten this Bill is, every one of those sheep over there, when the vote on this dreadful Bill is taken, will stand up and be counted as supporting it. I think that is a rotten shame.

Mr. Fisher: Baa!

Mr. McCuish: The last time I saw a mouth like that it had a hook in it.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this Government is asking Parliament for money which it cannot prove to us that it needs. Despite its public relations program of restraint called six and five, what is in fact the case is that

this Government may talk about restraint but it shows as much restraint as a bunch of sailors on shore leave.

Mr. Laverne Lewycky (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to speak this afternoon on the amendment to Bill C-143, the amendment that has been moved by my colleague, basically proposing that this Bill be amended so that the borrowing authority be not now read a second time but that the order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof, particularly the subject matter of the clause pertaining to the borrowing authority for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

I think an awful lot has already been said, even today, with regard to what we are being asked to do as Members of Parliament here, in writing out a \$19 billion cheque for the Government to do with the money as they please.

I know that there have been statements made in this House, such as on Friday when the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Berger) said that all I would have to do would be to look in the Blue Book, look into the Estimates, and I would have answers to my questions there. Similarly, this afternoon the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Lang) seemed to imply the same thing, that it was very clear in terms of where the money would be spent. I have not had an opportunity to look at all the Estimates. The little bit I have had a chance to look at troubles me. I certainly do have my concerns and worries as to where this Government intends to spend its money, in what manner it will be spending it, and what approaches it will be undertaking.

• (1630)

One of the areas highlighted in the Speech from the Throne and in other speeches over the past three years of this session has been the area of multiculturalism and the whole Government thrust in that area. In accepting the invitation of the Parliamentary Secretary to look into the Estimates, I note that for 1981-82 the projected Estimate for multiculturalism was \$14 million. I notice in the Estimates for 1983-84 that the amount is \$13,720,000. I have difficulty comprehending why there is this kind of a reduction in a program such as multiculturalism. I am sure if I looked through the Blue Book I could find similar sorts of cutbacks or rollbacks, yet the Government has a greatly increased deficit.

The answers being provided are not adequate. This is all the more reason for a budget to explain exactly what type of philosophy the Government is now following, what its plans and goals are and what its programs will be. It is very important that we have some direction.

There have been several mini budgets but only one major budget recently. This indicates that the Government is a house divided. Enough proverbs have been cited to show that a house divided cannot stand. We have good illustrations of this. In the Income Tax Act legislation, we were asked to pass a hodge-podge of band-aid solutions. This is done from one year to the next on policies and programs the Government intends to