Supplementary Borrowing Authority

Throughout 1981 and 1982 we saw Canada geese flying across our screens, telling us how wonderful Canada is. We have had the ads telling us that energy self-sufficiency is this close. We have had the billboards saying that Canada is working. Where is Canada working? The unemployment insurance lines, that is where Canada is working. Now we have the advertising, the propaganda, the absolute and incredible propaganda where they can take our money and send me a box of goodies this long, full of pamphlets and posters and election stickers telling me all about six and five and Canada working together.

Mr. Fisher: I sent you that, Don.

Mr. Blenkarn: Sir, that stuff came under the signature of the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher).

Mr. Fisher: I am proud of it.

Mr. Blenkarn: The Hon. Member for Mississauga North says he is proud of the huge waste of taxpayers' money—

Mr. Fisher: I am proud of the program.

Mr. Blenkarn: —on pure, unadulterated propaganda.

An Hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Blenkarn: He ought to be ashamed of himself because he should take a look at last year's Auditor General's Report which shows this Government blew at least \$50 million in extra photocopying costs.

Mr. Fisher: I like the program, Don, do you?

Mr. Blenkarn: He likes extra photocopying costs, that is the kind of costs he likes.

Well then, Sir, we came to the further Borrowing Authority Bill where the Government came to the House and asked for \$15 billion. We said, "You cannot show me this \$15 billion. Cut your costs down to \$11 billion, and with a limited debate we will let it through, but no more. You want that extra \$4 billion, you have to come here." They are here tonight, 15 or 16 weeks after that Bill—

Mr. Deans: After you promised it to them.

Mr. Blenkarn: And all of a sudden the Government needs more money and there seems to be no end to its appetite, because if you look at these almost unbelievably inaccurate figures set out in what is alleged to be a financial statement given by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) yesterday, the \$4 billion is not enough and the Government is going to be back here again with another Bill and another Bill and another

When, Sir, is this overwhelming majority of sheep, which does not want to pay any attention to the realities of economics, going to say to their own leadership: enough is enough? Sir, it used to be said by the Members of the New Democratic Party, I have heard it said by them many times, that borrowing or deficit financing, or whatever you call it, is stimulative. I do not know how you can be stimulative by putting the country in debt. Nobody is ever stimulated by a great big debt hanging

over their head. This country is faced with a huge debt over its head. Sir, if you have been in business, you may borrow money to buy a machine or buy a plant or something of that nature, and you buy that asset on the basis of its payback. You buy a machine, you probably want in this market a payback in two or three years. You figure the machine must earn enough for you to pay for itself and on that basis you can afford to borrow money to buy it. Where is the payback in this borrowing? Where is the infrastructure being built with this borrowed money? The answer is, Sir, that there is nothing being built. It is being spent on the groceries.

There is no effort being made to cut back on the administration, no effort to cut back on a whole host of programs. I call them alphabet soup programs. We have a couple mentioned here in the budget papers. I see we have a program called CCDP and LEAP and PED, whatever that is, and then of course we have that wonderful program of nip, dip, and ship, and a rehabilitation program of some kind, I have forgotten the initials for that one. You almost have to be a magician to figure out what programs and what new letters they will put together for another program.

Every one of these programs requires a host of administrators. They require a set of applications, usually in quadruplicate or quintuplicate, filed and submitted and read and crossread and a cheque issued, maybe, if you know the right person.

Sir, there has to be a limit to this. There has to be a reexamination by this Parliament, before this Bill is completed, of where we are going in Government expenditures. Surely to goodness this financial statement, which seems to have found \$1.1 billion somewhere for further job-creation programs, could find another \$2 billion or \$3 billion or \$5 billion in additional administration expenses.

Sir, let me point out to you one thing very quickly. The National Accounts tabled in the budget papers indicate that expenditures by the Government for current goods and services in the years 1981-82 were \$16.898 billion, which have risen to \$19 billion, an increase of somewhere around 18 per cent or 19 per cent. Sir, that is the kind of thing which has gone on in one fiscal year. Talk about six and five! The expenses for goods and services have gone up 19 per cent. Where are we going? I admit, Sir, that this budget does say that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) has been instructed to make stringent restrictions in spending, and he will be reporting to this House. I say to the Hon. Members opposite that they have an obligation as Members of the Government to insist that the President of the Treasury Board make that report, and that that report be referred to a special standing committee or special committee of this House, it does not matter which. Then we as Members of Parliament could go over that report and over the other items that are available, such as the spending estimates of the Government, to determine which items of spending are essential, which are perhaps only less desirable and which items of spending are really nonessential.