

Time Allocation

to justify the use of closure today on the basis that it is inevitable spending, that somehow they have done their best. To be specific, he said that we put a spending policy in place in 1979 and he feels that things have not been too bad since that scheme was put in place.

Let us not forget the facts. Since this Government took office in February, 1980, just after the 1979 approach that he referred to, Government spending has increased by 68 per cent compared to an increase in the Consumer Price Index of 37 per cent and nominal Gross National Product growth of only 33 per cent.

There can be absolutely no doubt that the public of Canada want and are entitled to a fair debate concerning the Government's borrowing needs, yet we are being denied that. The Minister of State made the comment that after all, Parliament has had 24 hours to debate this matter. I am not too sure whether his arithmetic is correct, but if we divide 24 into \$19 billion, we find that he is talking about \$800 million per unit. The inference seems to be that after having talked that length of time, let us get on with it.

The Minister is totally ignoring that while there may have been a debate for several hours or days, and I doubt whether it was that long a debate, the fact is that in committee we were denied answers to question after question concerning why the Government needed not only these new funds, but what it had done with some of the funds it has already borrowed. The whole purpose of this forum, this talking House, if you like, this House of Parliament, is that we can debate and hopefully arrive at some consensus as to where suitable changes can be made.

We felt that if the Government needed the \$5 billion it was asking for in the current fiscal year, perhaps it should have that authorization. However, we felt there was no need, without understanding more fully what it was going to use the \$14 billion for next year, to give it that authority *carte blanche*. That is our position. To simply say that we have made our point, that somehow or other we have had enough days of debate and the Government is going to bring in closure to get on with it, takes away from Parliament one of its most sacred rights, control, not only of spending, but of borrowing that the Government proposes to do in the name of the people.

The only thing of real substance to which we are entitled in the House is to control Government spending and borrowing. Day in and day out we do not see true democracy in the sense of representative Government but, rather, an elected dictatorship, a dictatorship that goes to the country when they think they can get re-elected on trumped-up issues, so-called charisma. It is an attempt to hoodwink the Canadian public so that they can get back in control and run the country down further and further.

That is why I hope that for once Members will vote the way their conscience tells them to vote on this issue. I hope they will say on this particular point to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the Minister of State for Finance that Parliament should be allowed more time, and that, hopefully, some amendments can

be agreed to. I say that because it is most dreadful to look at this Government's handling of our economy.

• (1540)

Let me put this on the record: Looking at the public accounts data for the fiscal year ending 1982-83, we find in the November, 1981 budget the budgetary deficit as a percent of the Gross National Product would be minus 2.8 per cent. That is partly what we are talking of today, Mr. Speaker, this borrowing need, the Government's financial requirement for budgetary deficit. They told us at that time it would be minus 2.8 per cent. In the budget of June, 1982, it was up to minus 5.4 per cent of our GNP. In the financial statement of October, 1982, it was at minus 6.7 per cent of our GNP. And in the update of February, 1983, it had arrived at minus 7.8 per cent of our GNP. Yet we are told that, regardless of how it has misled this House and the public with respect to the current fiscal year, the Government would like us to sign a blank cheque for another \$14 billion to get it through, we are told, until about the summer. The Government is not sure how far this money will take it into next year, but it would like to have it in hand.

The Minister of State for Finance asks how we dare delay passage of this Bill because it may impede the Government's borrowing, taking it for granted that the Government has some right to go out and borrow, and taking it for granted that there should be no questioning of the expenditures which have led us into the malaise which I partly indicated from reading the Government's own figures. But we are now at the point, Mr. Speaker, where one tax dollar in four is used to pay interest on this Government's debt alone. It is phenomenal. If you would like to look at it another way, we are at the point where for every dollar of revenue which the Government now has, it is spending \$1.50. One-third, roughly, of the total expenditures at the federal Government level today is being borrowed to pay for it. That is totally wrong.

I have certainly heard Government Members say, "Well, this is what Keynesianism is all about". They believe that somehow if you are in a wrong economic time or in a slump, you should be willing to go into a comparatively larger deficit in order to bring yourself out. But let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. If a bigger deficit was going to help, you would think we would have one of the most booming economies in the world. The fact is that in the November, 1981 forecast, the 1982-83 deficit was said to be \$10 billion. In June they said it would be \$19 billion. In October they said it would be \$23 billion, and then finally it was \$27 billion. In short, this Government has allowed, in one fiscal year alone, its spending to go from an estimated \$10 billion in the red to \$27 billion, and what is now touted possibly a \$30 billion shortfall.

I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, because I believe when Hon. Members are asked to muzzle Parliament concerning the Bill which is before us, they really must ask themselves why. Why has the Government led us into such a high deficit position? Certainly, our socialists to the left like to talk about these short-term deficits. They, of course, have been one of the