

Borrowing Authority Act

is fed up with Ottawa. The article is entitled, "Fed up with Ottawa, disgruntled inventor heads south". The gentleman resided in Ebenezer, Saskatchewan.

Add John Appelt's name to the long list of disgruntled Canadian inventors.

Earlier this month Mr. Appelt, his wife Molly and son Russell packed all they could carry in a converted bus and headed for the United States, frustrated at the treatment the Canadian government and industry gave his latest invention, a grasshopper harvester.

Mr. Appelt, 42, who also works as an upholsterer, said he doubts he will return to this village 120 kilometres east of Regina, or to Canada to stay.

"A year ago, I was a solid Canadian and I thought it was the best country to be in," he said.

He goes on to explain his invention.

Mr. Condon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I ask the present speaker a question?

Mr. McKenzie: The hon. member may do so at the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman went on to say that he reserves his most scathing criticism for the federal Department of Agriculture which, he says, thwarted his attempts to get the grasshopper harvester recognized as a legitimate machine. The article goes on:

He believes the department discouraged him because his invention would use mechanical means, not chemical sprays, to control the prairie pests. "I solidly believe Agriculture Canada is bought and sold by the chemical companies," he said.

That is quite a charge, Mr. Speaker. The Montana Energy Research and Development Institute welcomed the gentleman down there and they will help him develop his new invention. This is another example of mismanagement and a very serious charge against a federal department's operation.

The Liberals are so anxious to replace the present Prime Minister that they want to have John Turner back. That is understandable. They would not want to look for a responsible person who has had a good record in office as minister of finance; they want somebody who was a total failure.

I would like to give some examples from the time when all this highly accelerated waste and mismanagement started. During the period in which the Hon. John Turner was minister of finance, spending by the federal government jumped by 99.8 per cent. To put it another way, it took us 105 years to reach a federal spending level of \$17,004.4 million. Mr. Turner doubled that figure in 44 months, taking the level of governmental spending in his brief term to twice that reached by federal governments since confederation. He is the person they want to bring in to replace the present Prime Minister! That is jumping from the frying pan into the fire.

● (1752)

Under the budgets which Mr. Turner brought into parliament, \$113 billion of taxpayers' money was spent, or at least borrowed. When Mr. Turner took over from Edgar Benson, inflation was running at 4.9 per cent. When he left, it was 10.6 per cent. Under the aegis of Mr. Turner, the cost of living jumped 38.5 per cent and the dollar, if one assumes it was worth 100 cents in January, 1972, was worth only 72 cents

when he walked out to Bay Street. Is this the man who should replace the present Prime Minister?

At the time John Turner was given the mantle in January, 1972, there were 544,000 people out of work. When he left, 732,000 Canadians were unemployed. In spite of record spending and all the measures he took to promote employment in business, only 69,000 jobs were created in the manufacturing sector from December, 1971 to December, 1975.

In 1972 there was a surplus of \$700 million in our current account balance, which is the equivalent of our country's checking account in international trade. In 1975 there was a deficit of almost \$5 billion. In the aggregate, since Mr. Turner took over the nation has had a current account deficit every year. It goes on and on. It is a disgraceful and unbelievable record. Apparently Mr. Turner has charisma. We have seen that in the past, but it is not one of the qualifications for running the country in a sound and businesslike manner. This is not Hollywood show business. The charisma gimmick has outlived its usefulness. That is the only reason why they want to bring this man back, but he will not fool Canadians.

The devaluation of the Canadian dollar has been caused mostly by mismanagement of the nation's business and government borrowing. No longer are we an attractive country in which to invest money. We cannot even encourage Canadians to invest in Canada. The Canadian dollar was overvalued because the present administration damaged seriously the financial solvency of Canada. In the 1978 fiscal year, the government could raise less than 80 per cent of the revenues required to finance its wild spending habits. In 1979 the government will be able to raise only 75 per cent of the required revenues. The international investment community distrusts a government willing to live so far beyond its means. They are unwilling to buy a currency which the government persists in debasing through excessive deficit spending. When will it end? It goes on and on. It never stops. It is completely and totally irresponsible.

The Canadian dollar was overvalued because of the government's inability to cope with any of Canada's current economic problems. Low real growth, high unemployment and high inflation have prevailed in Canada for four years. There are no signs of improvement. Meanwhile the government continues to take actions which harm business and investor confidence. It continues to make policy changes regarding wage and price controls, foreign investment controls, and a harsher competition policy. There is an increasing burden of regulation and government interference. Also, we are faced with continuing threats by the Prime Minister regarding increasing federal intervention.

The fall of the dollar was triggered by the election of the Parti Québécois in November 1976. Between the two of them, they have done a great job of downgrading Canada.

An hon. Member: They supported you in the by-elections.

Mr. McKenzie: I should like to refer to a few of our proposals which are supported by the Economic Council of Canada.