President of the Treasury Board say he controls spending and waste without coming to grips with that issue?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my hon. friend that if we examine one portion of the total expenditure plan, the Main Estimates which I tabled a few weeks ago, it illustrates that the rate of increase in expenditure is down from 17.5 per cent, as was the case last year, to 10 per cent this year.

● (1130)

My hon. friend should tell the whole story. He should also be willing to tell the House that when we take the total outlays in the Government's expenditure plan and add the reserves in it for supplementary estimates to the main expenditures and the matters contained in these outlays, the total outlays are down from a rate of increase of over 9 per cent last year to 8 per cent this year.

This takes into account the new initiatives, such as the increased payments under guaranteed income supplements to older Canadians. I hope my hon. friend is not objecting to that. It takes into account additional expenditures of at least $150 million to fight youth unemployment. I hope my hon. friend is not objecting to that. It takes into account the increased amounts we must pay, by law, to provinces for such things as post-secondary education and medicare. I hope my hon. friend is not objecting to that because that would be quite inconsistent with the statements made by his Leader.

Speaking of inconsistencies, I wonder what my hon. friend is getting at with his question, because when it comes to funds requested from this Parliament by the Government to enable Canadair and de Havilland to carry on, these are amounts that were agreed to not only by myself but the Government as a whole. They were voted on by Parliament, and it did so after the responsible Minister came to the committee and gave details of steps that were initially presented to Cabinet for the purpose of effecting the necessary improvement in the over-all management of Canadair and de Havilland. This information was provided initially to Cabinet and subsequently to the House, prior to the amounts in question being voted on.

As I said in the House yesterday with respect to further amounts being sought for these companies in the supplementary estimates, the responsible Minister is coming to the relevant committee and I believe he is coming to more than one committee. At that time he will put forward the information which he has on plans for reorganization. It is up to the members of the committee initially and then up to the House to say whether it is satisfied and to vote for or against the request for these funds.

Let me say to my hon. friend, the country as a whole and to the workers at de Havilland and Canadair in particular, that when one listens to my hon. friend's question, one can wonder what really is the desire of the Conservative Party. Is it the desire, as his colleagues were saying yesterday, to make sure that these companies continue to operate, or is it their desire to carry out another Avro Arrow debacle like the Diefenbaker Conservative government? If they were sincere about wanting to avoid that kind of debacle and preserving the jos and technology base of these two companies, he would not be speaking in that doubting, questioning and critical way about this proposal in the supplementary estimates. Where does he stand in comparison to the view of his colleagues who spoke yesterday?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I think the question asked by my colleague concerning Canadair, the fact that a $1.4 billion write-off has been effected on Canadair and that another $700 million is being fed into de Havilland and Canadair is legitimate. If the House of Commons means anything, it is a legitimate question. I noticed that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) absolutely refused to accept the legitimacy of the question and led back with a fist punching, political barrel of rhetoric that really disgraces the House totally.

In his speech here today, dealing with a borrowing bill in which he and the Government are asking for $29.5 billion of spending authority, he talked about delivering top value for the taxpayers' dollar. That is the kind of rhetoric with which the people of Canada are absolutely fed up. If we are getting top value for the dollar, why is it that out in British Columbia there are gravel beds where fish have spawned that are now covered with silt and the Government does not have the money to go and wash that silt off those gravel beds? Yet the same Department of Fisheries can increase its advertising budget to $4 million, a 31 per cent increase over the $3 million it spent in advertising last year. If we are getting top value for our dollar, why does the Department of Fisheries have to pay for beautiful colour ads advertising recipes on how to cook fish when there are recipe books in every kitchen of Canada that are better than the recipes the Department is giving. Why does it have to spend money on advertisements explaining where one can get information on the federal Budget? Why does he stand up here and tell us that the Government is cutting out red tape and will make life in the private sector a lot easier when all it is doing is superimposing more regulation and arbitrary decisions on the system and causing it to collapse absolutely? Can he answer some of these questions?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the concerns of my hon. friend. We share them. He has played a role in some of the initiatives for better management and parliamentary information that I have often talked about. I have recognized that in the past.

In responding to his colleague, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn), I was not suggesting that his question was not legitimate. As he says, this is what Parliament is for. Frankly, however, the way the Member for Mississauga South phrased his question could well suggest to people who are reasonably fair minded that he did not want to have this money provided. If it is not provided, these companies would not continue to operate. This is the reason for the response I made.