

**Mr. Blenkarn:** What we ought to have from the NDP and the Liberals is a proposal whereby we could develop a new form of agriculture. Maybe we could learn how to grow money trees. That is what we have here. We had a modest effort by the Minister of Finance on November 8 to try to come to grips temporarily with the financial conditions of this country. He brought forth certain cuts, terrible, disastrous cuts, vicious, brutal cuts. Why, Mr. Speaker? He had cut about \$2 billion from the real expense of the country, plus another \$700 billion or so out of the administration of Departments. These are terribly brutal, vicious cuts.

**Mr. Riis:** Can we quote you?

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Indeed, if there is any criticism of the November 8 statement, it is that those cuts were not severe enough, because there is no way we can continue to borrow, borrow, borrow, and borrow.

**Mr. Riis:** You are a walking mine field.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** We cannot put on the backs of our kids—the Hon. Member for Kamloops Shuswap (Mr. Riis) quoted me in previous speeches in the House on this matter—on the backs of our children's children, and children's children yet unborn, burdens that we are putting on them. Before this decade is over, if we carry on in just the way we are doing now, just with the forecasts of this Minister of Finance, we will have a national debt in excess of \$410 billion.

We are in the situation of a frog in a well, only the well has awfully slippery sides. We try to get ahead, we cut expenditures, yet we cry about them.

**Mr. Riis:** Cut taxes.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** And then we find the interest rate keeps going up and the cost of interest keeps going up, and pretty soon we wind up with a situation where interest expense itself is the major cause of the deficit of the country, as it is right now. Only yesterday Members saw a release from the Minister of Finance indicating the financial position of the country for the period ending September 30. What was the financial position of the country? For every dollar we spend, we borrow 39 cents. What kind of sense of obligation, what kind of sense of purpose, what kind of sense of frugality and what kind of sense of direction of the country is that when we borrow 39 cents out of every dollar we spend? And that is for the first six months of the year. If this carries on, very soon we will not be able to borrow sufficient money to pay the interest on the borrowed money.

We are rapidly getting to the point where we are leaving our children a bankrupt, insolvent nation. Perhaps the only way we will solve our credit problems is to declare bankruptcy. Perhaps we ought to be proposing that this Bill be called "The National Insolvency Bill for 1984-85 and 1985-86", or "The Waste of Canada's Heritage Bill", or "A Bill to make sure our Children are Bankrupt".

### *Borrowing Authority*

Things cannot go on like this, Sir. We hear Members from the other side say, "My goodness gracious, you are going to charge something more for getting citizenship or a passport. My goodness gracious, ferry rates are going to go up 15 per cent perhaps". Or we hear them say, "My goodness gracious, you will have to get tough with people because they play around with the unemployment insurance scheme. Gee whiz, isn't it terrible?" We have to operate this country with a sense of frugality, Mr. Speaker. I know they have not been used to that. They believe we have one great money tree, that it is all wonderful, and spend, spend, spend, and spend. That is the attitude of this city. That is the attitude until now, and that attitude must change. It will change.

We have taken over a problem that will not easily be solved. I said before the election that we could not clean up this mess in ten years. It is at least that bad. It is going to take us at least this decade to begin to get this country's finances back in some reasonable shape. We have taken one weeny step so far and all we have are crocodile tears.

Let us talk about it for a moment. Let us talk about the Unemployment Insurance Act which they say is so sacred. Let us talk about the fact that I saw a proposal for a man here in Ottawa being offered early retirement. Included in that proposal was a statement made by his employer that he could collect unemployment insurance for a full year and not have to apply for work because unemployment insurance is paid to him. Is it fair for a person who retires early to get 98 per cent of his former wages because of unemployment insurance payments and \$32,000 per year in his pay package? That is not my concept of unemployment insurance.

● (1700)

The other day I was speaking with my young brother who runs a construction company. He said that his fellows work 55 hours per week in the summer-time. They build up pretty good pay packages, but as winter approaches they cannot work 55 hours per week. They are lucky to be able to work five hours or seven hours per day. Some days they cannot work at all because of the weather. I would like to indicate what is done in his company. They raffle off the right to be on unemployment insurance because they can make more money on poge than they can working. That kind of thing has to stop. If members of the New Democratic Party and of the Liberal Party want to defend that, they should come to my riding and defend it. They should defend it with the people of this country because they know that that is not cheating, but it is an absolute abuse of the system. The system must be changed. We must get at that problem. We must reduce the deficit.

We must not allow the problems raised in the financial statement, and the suggestions, which only begin to touch the problem, to interfere with our judgment as to how we come to grips with the damage that has been done to our children and our children's children. There is an amendment before the House indicating that we really cannot do this. I have spoken on such an amendment before. I do not like the situation. The Government brings forth a two-part Bill. Part I indicates that