

When Otto Lang instigated the Western Grain Stabilization Program, the formula was set up to address the cash flow problem faced by farmers. There is \$1 billion of farmers' money in that fund, yet the Government will not put in place the formula that would allow a pay-out to address their cash flow problems. This shows how serious our financial problems are and it shows the inability of the Government, of the Cabinet and of the Prime Minister to deal with them.

We have before us a Bill for advance grain payments to producers. We have been calling for that for months and we will give it quick passage. It would allow a farmer to borrow certain amounts of money in advance of delivering his grain. This Government has dragged its feet on agricultural matters.

● (1610)

Concerning the national energy policy, I sat in the committee and saw this Government move to the point where, as we heard today in the House, it is costing the consumers of Canada over 50 cents a gallon more for gasoline here than it does in the U.S. Remember the 18 cents a gallon, Mr. Speaker? Remember how terrible it was that the Conservatives were inflicting an 18 cent a gallon tax on gasoline on the Canadian consumer? Well, we now know the reality.

We on this side have called again and again for the removal of federal fuel taxation on food-producing lands. The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) moved a Private Members' Bill in that regard so as to improve the production of food. Again the Government fails to move and address the problem. This Government, this Prime Minister and this Cabinet must put its priorities in order. We have productive people, productive farmers. But unless we give them tools, opportunities and a fair chance, they will not be the engine of stimulation of the economy. Farmers contribute over \$8 billion to the economy. In return, they get back \$1.25 billion from a \$100 billion budget. I think it is fair for the people of Canada to call upon the Prime Minister to address these very, very serious matters of finance and to reconsider the manner in which he handles the taxpayers' money.

I could read into the record the continuation of a long list of spending by this Government. Under this administration, the paper pushing bureaucrats cost the taxpayer some \$17 million for 12,600 metric tonnes of office paper, which works out to roughly 90 pounds for each civil servant. We have done a great job in this country of circulating paper and spending, in this case, \$17 million, but what is the return? That is the question this Government has to start asking itself very seriously. We have \$50 million for the Maislin trucking company. Again this morning we saw the example of \$3.5 billion for Canadair in excess spending. No wonder we have these heavy-handed methods being used by Revenue Canada to collect funds, which are necessary, should I say, when the Government has been very, very lax in spending the taxpayers' money.

I think it is only fair that we call for responsibility on the part of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet, indeed on the part of each backbencher, regarding the handling of the taxpayers' money.

Borrowing Authority Act

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this debate on the latest in a long series of Bills to provide borrowing authority to the Government. The purpose of Bill C-21 is to borrow some \$29.55 billion for the fiscal year 1984-85. That rather staggers the imagination, but I suppose we have become inured to this kind of request from the Government over the past few years. But we should not be complacent simply because it has become the norm rather than the exception.

In this request the Government has asked for some \$4 billion to cover unforeseen contingencies. One of my colleagues from the Conservative Party wondered aloud a few moments ago about what some of those contingencies might be. I have to wonder whether or not the fact we are in the fifth year of the Government mandate has any bearing on those so-called unforeseen contingencies.

Another matter of some alarm is the use to which the Government is putting many of its larger items of expenditure. I and my colleagues appreciate, as do many Members on both sides, the necessity for avoiding a collapse of the Canadian aircraft industry. Many of us here have seen that sort of thing take place in this country in the 1950s and 1960s. We do not particularly want that to happen again, but it is more than puzzling to think of the odd sense of priorities the Government must have when it devotes \$1 billion, \$2 billion or more to the future of a single corporation which employs some 7,000 to 8,000 people, while that same Government, when faced with the crying need for investment in an industry, such as the forest industry which contributes more than the next five industries put together to the Canadian economy, watches that industry starve and the resource disappear. In British Columbia, for example, the Government has cut its spending on the forest industry from an anticipated \$52 million down to \$5.5 million in this year. The Government's own reports suggest that within the next five to 20 years we are going to see 30,000 direct jobs and another 30,000 indirect jobs disappear in that Province alone, and that will require a massive bailout of B.C. by the federal Government. What sense of priority can the Government have when that minuscule amount, relatively speaking, is denied for whatever reason?

● (1620)

It can so easily, meanwhile, as it has done again and again, devote billions of dollars to one corporation employing 7,000 or 8,000 people. That reminds me of the conservative Premier of the Province of British Columbia. He said that by the year 2000 high-tech is going to be British Columbia's number one industry. That is not necessarily because it is going to grow, but because they are going to let their basic strengths disappear and wilt on the vine. The Government seems to be doing exactly the same thing.

It makes no sense to build pyramids, no matter how shiny and new. Every time politicians get into trouble they build pyramids. They have been doing that for 5,000 years. It is rather important for them to pay at least equal attention to the basic resource industries which are our major strength in the