

has been sent to his resting place in External Affairs. What we have had is the policy of spend, spend, spend, no hard decisions, no choices, no priority giving at all, until we find ourselves in this position, that caused the present Minister of Finance to bow a little in the direction of some programs, which are important and which were contained in his last budget, and to defer the taxation and payment for those programs somewhere down the road when our Government will likely have to deal with the matter.

In the meantime, as the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake said, it has accumulated, up to and including this Bill, a borrowing record for any government per capita in North America an amount of \$51.83 billion since June, 1982. That is \$4 billion a month. That is what it amounts to. Why do I mention that figure, this grasping for borrowed money, this mortgaging of the future? Why do I mention that figure in relation to the Minister of National Revenue? I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. I want to bring to his attention a case of a small company that has been victimized by the Department of National Revenue for the sake of some \$60,000. This is an amount the company owes because it did not pay withholding tax on salaries. The company admits that was wrong. It was balancing priorities. The Minister's Department moved in on this company. The story is in today's paper. The company involved is Kitcraft Enterprises Ltd. This company is located in the riding of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin). Where was he when that company needed protection? Where was he? The Department moved in and tried to collect \$60,000. The Department did this when it knew there was evidence that the company was negotiating—it had the support of the bank—with the Eastern Ontario Development Corporation for more funds. What is their position now? If the company goes bankrupt as a result of the move by the Minister of National Revenue, the Government will not get the \$60,000. The 20 workers or others who might come along will not get any security of employment in that situation. That is not supportive of a small business doing its best to get itself out of a difficult problem. I suggest that when that happens and the Government in the same breath asks me to approve, willy-nilly, \$14 billion in borrowing, I will have to say that the Government has its priorities all wrong. That \$14 billion in borrowing and its addition to the deficit will not provide the atmosphere where small business or large business will look forward to an era where the deficits will become less and less a drag on investment opportunities and opportunities to expand.

I listened to the Minister of Finance's budget speech. I tried to find some place where he did what should have been done, not wipe the deficit out in a week, or a month, or a year, or two years, but at least begin as my seatmate did, the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Crosbie), who began in his own way to attack the deficit in 1979. But the difference between 1979 and 1983 is that we have lost those years. Members on the Government side know that. It burns me up when I read in the paper about the Government's sweating the taxpayer, putting someone out of business for \$60,000, which action will not do the Government any good. The Government will not collect the

money. At the same time that the Government does that it comes into the House and has the guts to ask the House to approve out of hand a borrowing that is criminal in its size and sinful in its intent, because its actions do not do one thing to lower the deficit. They do absolutely nothing to lower the deficit. Then I read the same budget which, in human terms—

Mr. Lang: Job creation.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): The Parliamentary Secretary says job creation. If the Parliamentary Secretary had read the budget of the Minister of Finance, he would know that the unemployment rate during the period of time for which the Minister of Finance predicted is not going to change appreciably, and that he and other Members of Parliament are going to have day after day after day coming through their offices people whose legacies have been forgotten by this Government. I am talking about the young people of the country, those between the ages of 14 and 25 years for whom, as any statistical analyst will tell you, there is no hope of any change. I am an optimistic person by nature. I heard that budget, the plaudits, the acclaim, but I saw those statistics in terms of employment. I read the column of Jack McArthur in the *Toronto Star* who argues:

It's true that the jobless rate for the 15-to-24 age group has bloated to terribly high percentages.

But then Mr. McArthur says:

But it hasn't increased any more rapidly—

Isn't that a comfort? Mr. McArthur does not say unemployment will go down. Mr. McArthur says it will increase, that it is going to maintain itself. We have become used to these high figures in this country. We have become used to sin. We have become immune to these figures and these things. But I am not immune to them. I think they are a shame. I believe that before a government comes before Parliament to ask it to approve this kind of borrowing it had better do something about those people, that small business to which I have referred and a host of other people and businesses who are finding they are disadvantaged at the end of a long Liberal tenure.

• (1700)

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution of the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) who I think has put a great case before the Minister. As a farmer I have been required to go to the bank quite often this last while to try to keep my enterprise going. The banker is becoming more reluctant to say yes. In fact, the next time he may say no. We all know that there are limits on individuals in society as to how much they can borrow, yet the Government in this session of Parliament kept returning to borrow more and more money for programs. I believe the Government came before us seven times in this session of Parliament.

I have listened to my grandfather and my father talk about the recession and Depression of the 1930s and how they grew