

*Borrowing Authority*

minutes from the United States one month ago and what the Government just did in its last Budget.

The postal subsidy is to be reduced by \$10 million in 1989-90, followed by a further reduction of \$35 million in 1990-91. The Government is thereby reducing the total subsidy from \$220 million to \$175 million by 1990-91. The Government has been less than forthcoming in making clear its intent with respect to these cuts if we try to figure it out from the Budget, the double-speak and the fiscal plan.

With the Canadian magazine industry as a whole earning pre-tax profits of only 2 per cent, the implication of this cut is very serious. This is an example of the Government's view that cultural policy is so insignificant that when the Budget axe falls, nobody at the Cabinet table cares. For the Government, it is no more than a dollar and cents game.

I believe that these cuts in the cultural area show a Government willing to attack programs that support and promote our national identity. Without the arts, without distribution, without fair access, without equality across this vast land that allows us an appreciation and understanding of each other, just who are we and what do we stand for?

In one decade, the Government will have reduced the CBC's appropriation in constant dollars by close to \$400 million. Across the way, I see a Government that has achieved what it failed to achieve through policy through a Budget door. Canadians have rejected the dismantling of the CBC, so the Government is now doing it through the Budget process. That is not something the Government should be proud of.

The Canada Council lobbied hard and almost received a promise for an additional \$47 million in its parliamentary appropriation. It received an increase of \$1.7 million, not even enough to cover the cost of inflation. The Director of the Canada Council, Joyce Zeamans, said that the effects of no increase will be that we will have a new generation of artists that is not being fully served.

That will be part of the Government's legacy in its cultural portfolio.

I have one further observation to make regarding the National Arts Centre and its future. Since 1984, it has been starved by the Government. In fact, the Government cut approximately \$10 million from it in today's value, to say nothing of what has happened to the status of artists who have not received fair treatment or protection. If time would allow, I would add an additional list to the litany. However, I recognize that my time is up.

I conclude my remarks by saying that this is the 20th anniversary of the Department of Communications and Culture. The Government should be ashamed of what it has given it as a present.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C-11, the Borrowing Bill, which seeks to authorize the borrowing of \$25.5 billion. Of course, this Bill is an integral part of the budgetary process, a Budget which cuts social programs and regional development, spells the death of VIA Rail and fails to deal with many of the current problems facing Canadians.

Over the last year, we have heard much of the major problem that has been preoccupying Canadians individually and in the media and that is the increasing problem of adequate, affordable housing. A number of things have happened in the last two to three years that have made housing the problem that it is today.

First, there has been a dramatic increase in the price of housing, particularly in Toronto and Vancouver. In Toronto, since 1984, the price of houses has gone up 154 per cent. In Vancouver, prices are up 88 per cent. At the same time, vacancy rates in rental accommodations are dramatically down. Toronto has a vacancy rate, by last reports, of less than .2 per cent. In Vancouver, it is less than .1 per cent.

There are other major problems that are fueling the housing crisis. There has been a decline in real family income since 1980. Family incomes for average working families have gone down \$725 in buying power in that period of time while the Government has been raising taxes. This means that families have less money to put into housing. As well, 60 per cent of all single parent families headed by women have an income below the