

*Borrowing Authority*

● (1510)

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1981-82**

## SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY

The House resumed from Monday, February 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Bussi eres (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-59, to provide supplementary borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River):** Last night when I concluded my remarks I was speaking about the policy of this present government, which appears to be trying to borrow its way out of debt. I want to now continue what I have to say with respect to this borrowing bill.

The government is asking the House of Commons to approve another borrowing of \$14 billion. This sum, added to the \$12 billion which received approval earlier, totals \$26 billion. I wonder when the government will realize that this constant borrowing is simply shoving this country into bankruptcy, slowly but surely? When will the government realize that if we do not start paying our bills soon, as we expect our people to pay them, havoc will be brought on the people of this country.

The government asks us to look at its record, since it does not tell us what it will spend the money for. The government does not say what the interest rate will be or what the conditions of borrowing will be. It simply asks for carte blanche approval to borrow this \$14 billion. That is the way it is framed in the bill. This is a subject which I would like to deal with.

If the government had an excellent record and went to a banker with all the material we have in this bill the banker might be inclined to loan some money, but I am in doubt as to whether it would be \$14 billion. The banker would probably lend some money on the security of Canada. An individual who goes to the bank with this same type of arrangement and says to the banker, "I will not tell what the money is to be used for; you do not have to tell me what the interest rate is", would not get to first base in borrowing any sum of money from any banker in this country. This is what the government is doing with the representatives of the people. It is saying it will not tell us what it plans to use the money for but that it will simply borrow \$14 billion.

I wish to look at the record of the government to see if there is any reason to believe it might be planning to use this money to increase production, or to create production. As I outlined last night, if the money was to be used to create and increase production then there might be some sound reason to borrow the money. But the money is being used in many ways; the government is not saying what it is being used for. It may be used to finance another trip to Austria for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). He asks the people of Canada to spend their

holidays and their money in this country while he heads off to Austria to ski. The skiing is just as good in the Banff, Lake Louise, and the Hinton areas; which is good enough for Canadians but not good enough for the Prime Minister. These trips cost a lot of money. Maybe the money is being spent to finance another trip to Arabia. This will not create any productivity, it is simply spending money. You can borrow until you are blue in the face but if you are not creating productivity which can be used to pay back the principle sum, plus interest and some profit, you will bring on ruination. That is what is happening in this case.

I again ask if we can believe what the Prime Minister of this country says. The record tells the story. In 1968 there was a federal expenditure of about \$12 billion. Mr. Trudeau led the people of Canada to believe that—the Prime Minister led the people of Canada to believe—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I believe it is the practice to refer to members of the cabinet or the Prime Minister by their office rather than by their names, and to refer to hon. members by using the names of their constituencies.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I changed the words to "Prime Minister". But that does not sound any better to me. As a matter of fact, it sounds a little worse, since we expect the Prime Minister of Canada to be careful with respect to the expenditure of public money. After all, it is money which belongs to other people, not to him.

What happened in the Prime Minister's ten years in office? His expenditures went up to \$52 billion and then he went out of office. Do you not think he would have had time then to reconsider and make up his mind that, yes, mistakes had been made? The answer is no. The expenditures are now up to \$63 billion, with another deficit of about \$13 billion or \$14 billion. How can you believe what the Prime Minister says when this record gives us this type of information?

I would like to deal now with the civil service. What did the Prime Minister have to say about the civil service? In 1968 the Prime Minister promised to cut the civil service by 10 per cent. What happened? Instead of cutting it by 10 per cent he has increased it by more than 50 per cent—that is 100,000 employees. This is completely opposite to what he promised the people of Canada. Now the government brings in a bill like this and we are expected to believe it is doing something good, but we are not told what it is.

What about inflation? In 1968 the Prime Minister appeared on national television to talk to the Canadian people about inflation. I believe it was August 13, 1968. I do not know if that was a Friday or not, but it probably was. This is what he said:

We would be on the way to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control. 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.

That is exactly what the Prime Minister has done. He has placed hundreds of thousands of people on that treadmill.