

tries to suggest a course of action for the government and does so in a co-operative way, in a non-partisan way; unless we create an economic future and plan our economy so that we can reduce the deficit, then the requirement for borrowing money, which expanded from \$12 billion in June of last year to \$14 billion six months later, will be a rollercoaster proposition which will worsen.

I plead with the government to take advantage of this opportunity when it is a majority government. There are advantages in having a majority. It gives the government the ability to take the kind of action that will give stability and flexibility to our economy. By doing so, the government will be rendering a service to the Canadian people. If it continues on the present course, we in Canada will face a poor and unfortunate future. A country such as Canada with the potential it has, deserves far better.

**Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) for making his comments brief. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be the cause of members leaving the chamber.

For the past number of hours we have been debating the \$14 billion which this government wishes to borrow to subsidize its deficit. If this government were an individual or a company, it would declare bankruptcy. The problem is that the federal government has no place where it can file bankruptcy papers. I am sure that if it could, it would file them. You cannot have deficits continuously, as this government does, and go on and on, unless you happen to be the government.

We understand that much of the money that is allocated by this government goes toward western development. Hon. members in the government party have often referred to the figure of \$4 billion. We cannot find the \$4 billion in the budget. When we take a close look at the budget, we find \$2 billion to be spent over three years, but when we take another look to try to find out where this new \$2 billion will be spent, we find it is to be spent on existing programs. There is nothing new, nothing to benefit or assist the people.

I see the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) shake his head, but the fact is that the \$2 billion will not be spent on new programs. Let us see where this \$2 billion comes from. It comes from the \$37.5 billion which will be removed from the resources of western Canada in the next three years. The proposal is to return \$2 billion and to take away \$37.5 billion. This will not make people in any part of Canada respect a government which tries to promote such flim-flam and chicanery as taking \$37.5 billion and returning only \$2 billion.

I heard the hon. member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson) referring earlier this evening to prices which this government is charging for gasoline. I should like to read into the record figures representing the difference between what was proposed in the PC budget of December, 1979, and what is projected in

#### *Borrowing Authority*

the present budget for the year 1983. Under the December PC budget, the average annual tax on heating oil was equivalent to 19 cents a gallon. Under the Liberal budget, by December, 1983, the average tax on heating oil will be 55 cents a gallon, and that is before the purchase of Petrofina, as my colleague, the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) says. Under the PC budget, the average annual tax on gasoline was 39 cents a gallon. The average annual tax in 1983 under the Liberal government's budget will be 59 cents a gallon. In spite of this, hon. members opposite cried about the 18-cent increase we proposed! Under our budget the total tax, before the energy tax credit, for the average Canadian family would have been \$483. Under this budget, the average tax will be \$790. In our budget we proposed an energy tax credit because we had compassion and sympathy for middle and lower-income Canadians. It would have meant another \$220. Under our tax system, the average Canadian family would pay \$263, but under the system proposed by this bellicose government, they will have to pay \$790, and hon. members opposite are wondering why the people of Canada are saying that their budget is not that great.

Let us see why we have a deficit of \$14 billion. We have heard the reason given by members on the other side. The reason, they say, is that the government has a program and it needs \$14 billion. What do they need it for? They need it for JetStar trips. I would like hon. members opposite to listen. In 1978, under the old Liberal government, 431 trips were made, for a total of \$274,107,000. In 1979, under the Progressive Conservative government, 162 trips were made. Hon. members opposite are saying that is why we lost the election. They cannot really think that we lost the election because we were careful with the taxpayers' money. That cannot be the way they think of the taxpayers of Canada. I am sure that hon. members opposite have more sense than to think that our taxpayers can be purchased with their own money.

Let us look at the period of time when Otto Lang was minister of transport. I see there is a mistake in my notes here. The name of the minister is spelled "Auto", and I apologize for that because he took up more time flying. He made 30 JetStar trips in the same time period as the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) took three. Recently the JetStar has been used for 56 trips a month, or two trips every day including Saturdays and Sundays. The big user of the JetStar seems to be the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) who travels across Canada promoting himself. He is not of great assistance to my part of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the clock is moving ahead, so may I call it ten o'clock?