

not re-invested in the rail system of Canada. Obviously they were invested in the many other diverse operations of Canadian Pacific. They now come back to Parliament to say they need more money. Maybe they do in terms of movement of grain. However, they should be able to draw from the vast resources they have been given. They were originally given to them to subsidize grain transportation in this country. The companies have forgotten that, and the Liberal Government has forgotten it as well. They say the farmers should pay more to move their products to the ports and on to the markets.

We in the New Democratic Party say that the Crow rate should be maintained. On the other hand, the railways should not lose money in transporting grain to the ports. If the railways suffer a valid loss, they should be compensated, but not by the farmers alone. It should be by the people of Canada through their Government because of the vast importance of agriculture to the Canadian economy. This should be shared equally among all sectors of the Canadian economy.

Before closing, I would like to return to the item before us. The borrowing authority for \$19 billion is not looked upon favourably by myself as an individual Member of Parliament. It is shameful that this Government can come and ask us for this sum of money without laying out a plan, that it can simply ask us to trust it when it has betrayed so many trusts in the past.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): They are absolutely shameless.

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this Bill which the Government is insisting that we pass with undue haste. The Government is asking for a record amount under this borrowing authority of some \$19 billion. What is so unusual is that it is asking for part of the money for the present fiscal year, the majority of it, however, to be spent in the next fiscal year, even though we have not had a budget.

When the Government dealt with the financial mess this country is in last October, it gave us the up-to-date statistics and their projections. Four months later they need a further \$4 billion more than what they projected. In order to get through the end of fiscal 1982-83, they must increase the deficit from \$22.1 billion to the new figure of \$26.2 billion. The Government wants an additional \$4 billion. They are not sure why they want \$4 billion. They agree they need \$3 billion now. They want to borrow an additional \$2 billion for a possible \$5 billion for this fiscal year. If this money is not needed, it wants to transfer the \$2 billion into the next fiscal year. Therefore, it will have \$3 billion or \$5 billion for this year, depending on what it wants to do. It is rather unique for the Government to be in the situation of not knowing whether it will need that \$2 billion this year or keep it for next year when we are only 27 days away from the end of the fiscal year.

The part of the Bill which upsets most people who have been dealing with it in this debate and a great number of Canadians is that the Government, which promised to bring in a budget early in 1983, is now almost a quarter of the way into the new year and there is no intention of bringing in the budget until April or May, which will be one-third into the year.

Borrowing Authority

The Government is not telling us why or on what it intends to spend the money, but it wants \$14 billion to spend. I do not know whether this will go to financing more projects for Mr. Gillespie or toward hire more people in the situation of Donald Macdonald. Canadians are becoming a little jaded, tired and cynical about this Government and the way it spends money.

The House of Commons, its committees and individual Members, the whole system of Government, only works with a certain amount of goodwill, faith and trust by one side in the other. We have to work together. The Government has destroyed much of the trust, goodwill and faith that it might have had in its reservoir. The Hon. Members in the House do not trust the Government, they do not trust what the Government is doing and, I believe, by and large, that feeling reflects what the people in the country feel. The whittling away of the power of Parliament, the whittling away of the ability of Parliament or its committees to scrutinize the devious methods which the Government uses to get its will done, has made people very cynical about the entire political process. I do not believe that the Canadian people today have nearly as much trust in their politicians as they had just a decade or two ago. I do not believe that the Canadian people are willing to write a carte blanche cheque to the present Liberal Government for \$14 billion without receiving some indication of what it is in fact going to be spending it on, without getting some detail by way of a budget.

• (1600)

It was not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, that the former Minister of Finance set down what he thought was a practical, intelligent statement. I quote from the report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of May 31, 1982 where he said:

I do not think it would be appropriate to ask the House for additional borrowing authority until I have laid out in some detail an update of both the economic situation and the fiscal situation.

That rule was good on May 31, 1982, but less than a year later it does not seem to apply to the Minister of Finance any longer. Of course, we heard that rules were set down dealing with the conduct of Cabinet Ministers within a two-year period, but they did not apply, either. Just last October 27 *Hansard* records the present Minister of Finance making a promise. That promise was that he would introduce a new budget before he sought any more authority to borrow money. On page 20081 of *Hansard* he says, and I quote:

In the budget I intend to present early in 1983, I will review again the fiscal situation for the current fiscal year, set out estimates for 1983-84 and future fiscal years, and then seek additional borrowing authority as required.

So it is a precondition to seeking any more borrowing authority that we were going to have a budget with some detail as to what the Government's plans and projections were for the 1983-84 fiscal year, as well as the following fiscal years. The promise made by the present Minister of Finance on October 27, 1982, is now also out the window. We have had two Ministers of Finance in a row who have made promises and