

on this side of the House are trying to get across to the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen).

I used to be an investment dealer before I got into politics. As an investment dealer, any time one of my clients came to me and asked if they could raise some capital through the capital markets, I said, "What are you using the money for; what is the purpose of the issue?" We have seen nothing about what is the purpose of the issue today. We could debate this for the next two or three months if we wanted. Also we looked at the usefulness and the quality of management of the organization, and again I must say that it is an area we could be debating for the next two or three months as well.

We heard clearly from the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Johnston) that he is very disappointed with the quality of management in this organization. That quality has been building up over many, many years. Another aspect that we look at is whether there is any attempt whatsoever to reduce the loan or to reduce the demands on the public purse. I have seen nothing to indicate that in the period of time I have been here since February 18. Many times members on this side have said that the government is asking for a blank cheque. It is just as simple as that, because we have no idea what is happening. Ministers are asking us to provide them with the authority to continue the disastrous policies of the 1970s, with no accounting to Parliament. It is incomprehensible why there has been no understanding built up during this period of time as to the effects of high government deficit.

I fully support the various things the hon. member for Lincoln raised in the course of his remarks as to the importance of social programs. But the key thing we must realize is that if we cannot afford those social programs, it will hurt this country very, very seriously. The long-term damage being done to this country by continuing and accelerating levels of budget deficit are things we will be living with for many years, as will our children and our children's children. There is no way of getting away from that.

On many occasions we have said that it is essential the government bring forward a budget at the earliest possible opportunity, because the sorry excuse for a budget that was brought down in April is simply not good enough to get an understanding of where the government is going. Again we tried to get some understanding from the Prime Minister today and from the Minister of Finance on previous occasions. We are getting nowhere in understanding the direction of the policies of this government. That is why we say we need a budget.

The last time a budget was passed by this House was in November, 1978, a year and a half ago. That is why we need a budget before the summer recess. The distressing fact is that either this government does not have the wisdom and the intelligence to recognize the existence and the magnitude of the problem of a major series of deficits, or it understands the problem and continues on its way with a full understanding of the impact it has on the people of the country. They are borrowing money at today's rates and at today's value for the dollar, and they are paying it back in reduced dollars. As I

### *Canada Labour Code*

said, in 1968 the dollar was worth over twice what it is today. If we continue doing that, the only organization that benefits from it in the country is the Government of Canada. To hear the possibility that this government is considering removing indexing from personal tax exemptions is just removing one more discipline from stopping them continuing on the basis they have been for years. It is a classic example of buying the votes of Canadians with their own money.

What the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) was trying to do with his budget of December 11 was to show Canadians a way to get out of the sorry state we are in now. But we get from the government opposite policies which will permit them to get short-term gain unfortunately with long-term pain for this country.

May I call it five o'clock?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills, and notices of motions.

● (1700)

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

### CANADA LABOUR CODE

#### USE OF UNION DUES FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

**Mr. John Gamble (York North)** moved that Bill C-203, to amend the Canada Labour Code, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to introduce Bill C-203 for second reading and of exercising a right common to all members of this House, the right to change the laws by which Canadians are governed. I mention this rudimentary fact because it is often forgotten when we, as members of Parliament, are caught up with concepts of party solidarity and partisan politics. While I might have preferred to introduce Bill C-203 under circumstances where, with amendments to the rules and practices of the House, there was a greater likelihood of a vote on the same, I am nevertheless pleased to be able to address the issue contained therein with hon. members of this House.

Naturally I would be extremely gratified if Parliament shook off the mantle of executive control and provided a forum where individual members might freely debate the affairs of state and provide a direction for our country, unhindered by an all-powerful bureaucracy. Practice today, regrettably, precludes the realization of such a lofty hope.

The Canada Labour Code sought to be amended by Bill C-203 endeavours to regulate labour and management affairs