

then and will be up to at least \$1 million now. He is continuing to use the Jet Stars every weekend and so is the minister from Crowfoot. How will the Comptroller General control this? The government has no intention of setting an example of controlling expenditures. They never fooled me, Mr. Speaker, and they will not fool the Canadian people again.

In talking on this restraint bill the minister from Crowfoot said:

The bill before the House suggests that the government is going to curtail expenditures.

The minister from Crowfoot went on to point out that they have no intention of doing any such thing. He is now part of this particular government and will operate in the same manner.

What is the Comptroller General going to do about a government that gives low interest loans to communist countries? These communist countries have the money to fight wars around the world; a prime example is Cuba. There are 45,000 Cuban troops in Africa now. We found out in 1975 that CIDA was trying to conceal the amount of loans to Cuba. They wanted to give a no-interest loan but apparently somebody over on the government side had a little bit of conscience and so they settled for 3 per cent. We are pouring millions of dollars into a communist country which has all kinds of money to fight wars. What is the Comptroller General going to do in a situation like that?

● (2032)

I wish to refer to a former finance minister, and we have had many of those. This particular one is Mr. Turner. When he inaugurated the current spending restraint program in the budget of June 23, 1975, at that time the main estimates had received the approval of parliament. They forecast budgetary spending of \$32.2 billion. The main estimates for 1979 forecast budgetary spending of \$46.5 billion. Thus during the three years of the restraint program, the main estimates of budgetary spending have increased by \$14.3 billion, or 44 per cent. That is why I am so suspicious of this legislation to set up a comptroller general office. In fact, I do not trust the government. Their statements mean absolutely nothing.

I wish to refer to a statement made by the Prime Minister on August 13, 1969. He stated over television that we would have to control expenditures. He said we would be on the way to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control. He further stated that to spend vast sums on welfare, education and other programs while allowing inflation to continue would merely place hundreds of thousands of Canadians on a treadmill they could not escape. Since the Prime Minister made that statement, government spending has increased by 410 per cent to over \$35 billion. How can we possibly have any faith in the office of comptroller general? We will have to support it and hope that it works, but I believe it is nothing but window dressing.

The President of the Treasury Board stated that federal spending will rise by 9.8 per cent in fiscal 1979. This figure is suspect, but even if it is accepted, a 9.8 per cent increase in

Financial Administration Act

spending is hardly evidence of restraint. It goes on and on. Today we received a press release from the Information Division of the Department of Finance. In it the Minister of Finance announced:

Canada and the Deutsche Bank have reached an agreement for a private placement in Germany of 1.5 billion Deutsche Marks. The Deutsche Bank is a major commercial bank in the Federal Republic of Germany. It managed the private placement of DM notes issued by Canada in 1968.

All we hear from day to day is that the government are going to borrow more and more money. Where is the control? How is the Comptroller General going to control this? Today Canadian taxpayers have to pay \$6.5 billion a year in interest on the money they are borrowing. We are borrowing money abroad to pay interest on money we borrowed abroad. How irresponsible can they get? What amazes me are the backbenchers, who sit opposite supporting this. They have no conscience. They have no respect for the taxpayer. It is unbelievable. Yet the government say they are going to control federal spending.

I say tonight that federal spending will increase at a faster rate in 1979 than it did in 1978. Total federal outlays are expected to increase by 8.3 per cent in fiscal 1978. The administration expects outlays to increase by 9.8 per cent in 1979. I do not understand how the Comptroller General can accept this challenge he is taking on. Maybe he does not know the facts. I do not think he knows what he is stepping into. He is being led down the garden path.

Another large item of inflexible expenditures is the interest and servicing costs of the public debt, which I have just covered. Primarily due to the large deficits tolerated by the present administration, debt charges have increased by 82 per cent since the 1976 main estimates. An increase of that magnitude during a restraint program indicates that this administration sees no connection between restraint and living within one's means. In more human terms, the increase in debt charges over the life of the restraint program, 1976 to 1979, works out to an increase of \$215 per person employed, from a level of \$382 in the 1976 main estimates to \$597 in 1979. Public debt charges will become more burdensome in the future, as the present administration continues to tolerate sustained large deficits.

I do not know how the Comptroller General will deal with a government that allows the following kinds of expenditures under the Canada Council. This shows the disrespect they have for the Canadian people and their tax dollars. Here are some examples of how they hand out Canadian taxpayers' money. The council gave out \$8,000 for an illustrated glossary of household objects in New France. We have five million Canadians living below the poverty line, yet they hand out \$8,000 to somebody who does not want to work so he can study something like this.

Another one is \$5,275 for research on themes taken from *Apocalypse* in the work of Russian "Symbolist" writers. How on earth can an elected official tolerate handing out taxpayers' dollars for such hairbrained schemes? Only a Liberal government could do that.