Government Spending

I was really amused to hear the President of the Treasury Board asking us today to give him instances of cuts that we would make in expenditures, but before I deal with that matter I should like to talk about something else that we are discussing tonight.

Mr. McKenzie: Why don't you ask them to listen to what you are saying? They never listen to anything.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has the floor.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): It is his own member making all the noise over there.

Mr. McKenzie: You be quiet and listen.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order. The hon, member for Calgary North has the floor.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is my favourite speaker. A fellow always has to have one favourite speaker.

 $\operatorname{Mr.}$ Guay (St. Boniface): A point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order. The hon. member for St. Boniface is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that it was the hon. member for Winnipeg South making all the noise, not a member on this side. We are willing to listen to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams).

Mr. McKenzie: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not from Winnipeg South, and I think that the President of the Treasury Board should show some respect for the members of the House.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate this. Here I am arousing people and I have not really begun my remarks. The two points that we are making are straightforward. During the last 12 months the government has increased the supply of money by 15 per cent, and is continuing to do this in the binge it has been on for a long period of time. Secondly, we are suggesting a reduction in government expenditure.

I have one point I want to make at the outset. We are asking Canadians to follow certain guidelines and to accept certain restraints. In fact the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) went so far as to say in Toronto, "If you are not going to do this voluntarily and accept our controls, we will have an authoritarian kind of government and force you to". Our point is that if the government is to have credibility, it must set the example, and that is really the tone of my remarks tonight.

Coming back to the speech of the President of the Treasury Board, it reminded me of a conversation that took place between an Englishman and an American who were flying from London, England, to Kennedy airport. They had not got very far out over the Atlantic when the

pilot came on and said, "I am sorry, ladies and gentlemen, we have lost engine number one, there will be an hour's delay". They then went along a little bit further and the pilot came on again and said, "I am sorry, ladies and gentlemen, we have lost engine number two and we will be delayed two hours". They went on for another half an hour and the pilot came on again and said, "I am sorry, there will be a really serious delay because we have just lost engine number three". The Englishman turned to the American and said, "If we lose engine number four, we are going to be a day late"!

That, of course, makes just about as much sense as the speech that the President of the Treasury Board delivered this afternoon in asking us to set out emphatically some of the cuts that we would make. He is a lawyer, and he knows that before we could produce that kind of evidence we would have to have every one of the estimates audited.

• (2030)

There are a few things I could say to the President of the Treasury Board. I am rather shocked to know that his government went ahead in its attempt to build a new airport in the province of Ontario and spent \$100 million, without having an agreement with the provincial government.

Mr. Chrétien: We had one.

Mr. Woolliams: The government then scrapped the whole project.

Mr. Chrétien: We had an agreement.

Mr. Woolliams: If the government had an agreement then I have learned one fact tonight.

Mr. Chrétien: We had an agreement. The government of Ontario gave its word on that.

Mr. Woolliams: If you had an agreement then you also had an obligation to carry out that agreement, which has so far cost the Canadian people \$100 million.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: Let me make my second point, and I am now getting to the meat of this argument. If we are to find out what actually took place in respect of the Mirabel airport we will require a complete audit. I am confident that if the government hired accountants in Canada to do a complete audit of that project and gave them 50 per cent of the find, they would make the biggest treasures of their lives. I am sure of that in view of what has taken place in the building of that airport.

An hon. Member: Hanky-panky.

Mr. Woolliams: Those are just two incidents of wasted money on the part of the government, and a person could go on and deal with incidents of the sort all night. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) referred to a study in respect of national defence. He pointed that out when the President of the Treasury Board said we did not make any suggestions where cuts could be made. That study cost \$11 million which was paid to two United States