

which in itself indicates the Government's failure to do what taxpayers have had to do, and that is, bring its operations in line with reality.

As we begin to look at this request for borrowing authority we are reminded that since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came to office some 15 years ago, federal spending has increased more than eightfold. The Estimates of the Government tabled some months ago are part of the continuum of economic mismanagement going back to 1968. As we are asked to give approval to this and as we seek to indicate why we will not vote for this authority, we are reminded that the federal budget was comfortably in balance when Prime Minister Trudeau and his Ministers took control in the 1960s. The years that followed brought a record of increased deficits.

The Government's expenditures have risen from \$10.7 billion in the fiscal year 1968-69 to at least \$88.9 billion in the 1983-84 fiscal year. Of this amount \$2 billion does not have to be used this year and may be carried forward to the future. Thus the Government has a cushion of \$2 billion for this year plus a cushion of \$2 billion to be used in any year it may choose. This gives it far more flexibility than any Parliament ought to give any Government, let alone this Government with its track record of expenditures.

The authority granted through the borrowing Bill is only part of the picture. Many Crown corporations do not require special authority from Parliament to raise funds in the financial markets, nor must they tell Parliament what their financial requirements will be. I suggest there is no urgency for the passage of this Bill and that we as Members of Parliament have a right to give expression to the concerns of Canadians about the actions of the Government.

Part of that concern is reflected in the study undertaken by the Kitchener Chamber of Commerce on the matter of Government spending. It has undertaken a study of the Report of the Auditor General which was tabled recently and it has laid before the Treasury benches and local Members of Parliament copies of its comments. While these indicate that the Government seems to be paying some attention to the recommendations of the Auditor General in the March, 1982 report, the study contains this passage:

Notwithstanding the improvements in government control procedures cited above, we have continued concern, as does the Auditor General, with the significant waste and inefficiency in the federal government bureaucracy. In particular, we are much concerned with the very apparent use of Crown corporations for political purposes to avoid public scrutiny of government policy and ineptitude.

The study paper indicates concern about Crown corporations as a sub-Government and notes the effect of Government mismanagement and the climate for troubled companies, many of which are in the Waterloo regional area. At one point this report reads as follows:

Mr. Donald Johnston was recently quoted as saying that the current recession was responsible for eliminating a number of marginal Canadian companies and that we should alter our course and proceed with industries that are relevant and viable in today's economic environment. We believe that this policy should also apply to government ownership in the private sector through Crown corporations.

Borrowing Authority

The study deals with the management style of the Government in light of the management style that has been forced upon many small-businesses. The report has this to say:

In 1981-82, 33 per cent of the federal public civil servants collected a total of \$219 million in additional wages as compensation for overtime and at the same time took time off in lieu of payment at additional estimated \$25 million. Some public civil servants were paid more in overtime than their regular annual salaries.

This is at a time when the climate for investment and productivity was almost nonexistent, Mr. Speaker. The report says:

We concur with the comments of the Auditor General for the need for better planning of overtime . . . the control of absenteeism and the need for better allocation of overtime work.

In speaking against Bill C-151 for further borrowing authority, I suggest that not only are Canadian taxpayers concerned about the management of their resources but if there is to be expenditure, they are concerned about cost-effectiveness. As the same time as the Government wants great amounts of funds to use it is in the process of cutting off programs which could be of benefit and could be cost-effective in terms of our prison system, for example.

At the same time that it is seeking extra funds comes the penny-wise and pound-foolish announcement of the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) that it is too expensive to continue educational programs for prisoners even though there is proof that as a result of these educational programs prisoners come back into society with much less recidivism.

Members of the House and the public will be interested in the case of Larry Cybulski. The *Kitchener-Waterloo Record* of May 2, 1983, reports as follows:

Larry Cybulski's university education was cut short this spring only a few credits short of his graduation.

Up to that moment, his education had turned an angry young man into a person who "appreciates that there's more to life," says one of his professors, Elliott Avedon—

But the 34-year old Cybulski is serving a life sentence in Saskatchewan's maximum security prison in Prince Albert. In January, federal Solicitor General Robert Kaplan cut off money for his correspondence courses at UW, saying prisoners must pay for their own education from now on.

Cybulski is one of 232 out of 10,000 federal prison inmates who are trying to improve themselves through correspondence and in-prison courses. He is proof that education is one of the most successful and cost-effective forms of rehabilitation that prisons have going for them—

This is the reason that university administrators, members of the John Howard Society, members of adult education associations and others have joined in condemning this shortsighted action. It is also why, in the light of no real plans for additional borrowing authority and the failure to be wise in the use of funds that are available, I will join with other Members on this side of the House in voting against the request of the Government for this authority.

● (1740)

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today, again, is the Government asking Canadians to pay more money. It is asking the Canadian taxpayer, through the legislative process, to give authority to this Government to