

Borrowing Authority Act

they have tied their hands with respect to dealing with their problems in a realistic fashion.

Yesterday evening I was out in New Brunswick. My trip had to do with another aspect of deficit-cutting. I was out at a place called Oromocto. I met with about 200 people, men and women, who have been affected by the recent change to the Unemployment Insurance Program. All of these people were very upset and angry. Their own Members of Parliament did not attend the meeting. Their own Tory Members were nowhere to be seen.

Mr. Manly: They were out talking to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Rodriguez: I told them that in order to see one Member they would have to go to South Korea to do it.

Mr. Corbett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that the Hon. Member does not want to mislead the House intentionally. I think that for his benefit alone it is important to point out that the Tory Members to whom he alludes were both in Ottawa because they had not received an invitation to attend the meeting. However, they attended a meeting some two weeks ago at which the Hon. Member was not in attendance. I wonder why.

● (1650)

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I know that one of the Members who was supposed to be in Ottawa was at the opening of the New Brunswick Legislature two days ago in Fredericton.

Those people were very upset because in fact it was the same principle of cutting the deficit. The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) has written to them indicating that the Government had to reduce the deficit and therefore had to cut the deficit in the Unemployment Insurance Program. This is why \$100 million will be taken out as a result of the pension change. Those people found that to be unfair and unjust. They think that the Government has picked on them. In the same breath, the Government gave a \$500,000 capital gains tax break to the wealthy people of Canada, a break which will cost taxpayers \$1.5 billion by 1990-91. Those people found that very difficult to comprehend, and I do not blame them. The Liberals used to display the same reaction when they were in Government. Their friends always had their ear, their friends from Bay Street got all the breaks, and ordinary working men and women were shafted every time. I can assure Hon. Members opposite that just as the people across the country brought them in on a wave, they will put them out in the next election.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions or comments. The Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Fontaine).

Mr. Fontaine: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez), I think I have to

give him some credit for saying that for the first time in several decades, we now have a truly national Government.

As for the rest of his speech, it is not terribly significant. The Hon. Member compared the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. He said their positions are similar. I can inform him that the Conservative Party consists of administrators whose objective is to legislate a balanced use of our resources. It is an objective people have forgotten. The Liberals were socialists. Their philosophy was to pay people's grocery bills and spend more by borrowing more and making this country carry a debt load of \$240 billion.

Your job is to criticize. You always criticize but never suggest anything constructive. It is about time you did, which would be something new.

When we want to spend more you say no. When we want to save more you say no. When we want to raise taxes you say no. When we want to reduce taxes you say no. When we want to borrow more you say no. When we want to borrow less you say no. The pattern is becoming quite clear.

You quoted *The Globe and Mail* because you feel it has some credibility, so I will quote it too. Your leader is looking for a replacement. He is tired of playing an actor's role, but he does not think that any of the 30 others sitting there can pass muster. There lies your problem. You are unable to raise important issues. Think about it. You are unable to raise important issues and marshal a consistent and enduring defence of your own theories. That should be your role as legislators, but you are still asleep and never did anything constructive.

This is just a reminder. Do explain your theories if you can.

[English]

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member said that the Conservative Government is made up of administrators, bankers, accountants and tax lawyers.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Ordinary people.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, the Government is made up of ordinary rich Canadians. I do not know how consistent the Conservatives are. I am not impressed with their ability to administer. For example, a Budget came down in May, 1985 which was to deindex pensions. They were all over the ballpark on that one. They were telling us that the National Energy Program was a bad thing. They brought in the Western Accord. They could not even project what oil experts were saying six months down the road. They could not project what the experts were saying, telling or writing about the oil industry. They exposed the whole Alberta economy to the whims of the Sheikhs of Araby. Now they have a new sheikh—Sheikh Getty of Alberta. He is attempting to climb in the tent, and they are all sitting around. However, they recognize that he is not a true sheikh because his eyes are blue. They knew that he did not really belong there. They told him to go out and cut his production and then come back to join them. I do not know where they are in that ballpark now, but they are dealing with wheat prices. I want to