

### *Borrowing Authority*

commitments, set down guidelines, and now the Government does not want to follow them. What we have been asked for by the introduction of Bill C-143 is a carte blanche cheque for \$19 billion, "some of which we are going to use this year, some next year, and the part we are not sure we are going to use this year, we are going to carry over to next year." I do not believe anyone would lend anyone such a large sum of money, or give anyone a line of credit, without knowing what their projections were and why they wanted it.

The interesting part is that this Liberal Government has become so used to spending money, it is not really sure why it needs it. Let us take a look at some historical facts. In 1968-69 when the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) first came to office as the head of the Liberal Government, the Government only needed \$12.4 billion. That has increased now to \$90.6 billion for the upcoming year, which is an increase of 630 per cent.

I see that my time has now run out and perhaps I will have an opportunity to continue with this point when we get back to the main motion.

**Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Horticultural Council met in session in Ottawa earlier this week at its annual convention, providing an opportunity for farmers of horticultural crops from across Canada to get together to discuss various aspects of their business in which they have shared interest. The concern of the Horticultural Council this year reflects the damage which the recession is doing to the farm communities. To this extent, farmers have much in common with other segments of our Canadian economy.

Nearly every domestic Canadian producer is troubled by the share of the Canadian market which is taken by cheaper offshore products. Our problem in farming in Canada, as in manufacturing, is that our cost of production in many instances exceeds the costs of competitive foreign products delivered to our Canadian markets. One of our main Canadian distinctions, which presently work against our competitive effectiveness in all segments of our economy, is to be found in the expanding share of our Gross National Product which is being seized by Government. The demands of Government are presently dramatized by Bill C-143, a request for authority to borrow an additional \$19 billion simply to keep the Government operating for the next several months, and operating in its "normal" fashion, I might say. Borrowing of this magnitude must tell Canadians that one reason we are losing our competitive edge is that the money which the Government spends eventually costs us in tax dollars, eventually reflects in the cost of every commodity we produce, and eventually makes Canada less competitive than other areas of the world.

There is no pleasure in responding to the challenge thrown out by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) when, on February 17, he asked the House to approve the request of the Government for authority to borrow \$19 billion. This House, if it is foolish enough to approve this latest borrowing authority Bill, will be simply shifting a permanent burden of debt to the backs of the youth of Canada who, like my grandchildren,

Tara, Lucas, Tasha and Trione, will be the future wage earners and taxpayers of our nation. How can there be any suggestion of a docile acceptance by this House of the request of the Minister for yet another \$19 billion? When and where is it going to end? I believe it will only end when the Government itself is prepared to discipline its own fiscal demands. The six and five restraint is for others, not for this Government. That is very apparent.

*Saturday Night* magazine, in its February issue, deals with this issue in an article entitled, "Is Government spending out of control?" It quotes Dian Cohen as observing:

The \$76-billion budget, . . . "means that three and a half million Canadians are working all year so that the government can spend their money."

The article goes on to state:

The government's "six and five" restraint programme offers little in the way of economic substance, . . . pinning the blame for a faltering economy, or even the blame for high government spending, on the pay package of public servants is a gross distortion of reality.

I would like to read what the article says about the six and five restraint program. It says:

Savings generated by "six and five" will reduce total government expenditures by less than one per cent.

● (1610)

The patent phoniness of Government Members representing their six and five policy as being responsible for the lowering inflation rate is in character with past distortions. The Government they support so obediently has killed the economy, wrecked the ambition and hope of the people, offended investment, and reduced the spirit of adventure and risk-taking by removing opportunities for success. Having broken the confidence that Canadians have had in themselves historically, as well as in their Government and their country, having killed the expectations of Canadians by placing more than 1.5 million people on the unemployment rolls, Members opposite engage themselves in chest thumping in unison, claiming for themselves the success for six and five which they could not possibly under any circumstances have achieved.

Crediting the six and five program with bringing inflation under 10 per cent is about as rational as the farmer who goes into the chicken house, kills all the chickens, and a week later takes pride that the weasels are no longer getting the eggs. Or perhaps like the arsonist standing in the cold ashes of his house, taking pleasure in the fact that he no longer spends anything on house repairs. This Government's achievement is that it has killed the economy, not that it has succeeded in reducing inflation.

The Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson), who I am sorry to say is absent, challenged us to be honest; be moral, he said. What advice from a source which recently demonstrated that this Government considers anything which benefits Liberals to be moral! The failure of the Government to provide a rationale for its borrowing authority demands is an indication of its contempt for Parliament and the nation. Or is it that this Government is simply so utterly ashamed of its role in bringing the economy to a state of collapse that it cannot