

Government Orders

Nations which has spoken out critically against this government on behalf of aboriginal people. They have cut back support for women's groups which again have been critical of this government. They have also cut back support for the future of our country. For example, they have cut back support for science and technology.

This is a government which says in all its rhetoric that it wants to improve science and technology support and, yet when it comes to the test, when it comes to a budget, science and technology becomes a target for cut-backs, just as has been the case in the past. It is not the first time that science and technology has been attacked.

I see a former prime minister, the right hon. member for Yellowhead in the Chamber. I know that his government gave much more support to science and technology than this government has been prepared to do. Instead, it seems that this government has seen as its goal to talk with fervour and passion about the importance of science and technology to the country and then to turn around and slice and chop and cut so that in fact science and technology did not get the support it needs for the future.

We had a brief this morning in the Standing Committee on Science and Technology which talked about some of the important developments in Newfoundland associated with the attempt to take science and technology and tie it to regional development for that part of Canada. Some very important ideas came forth. The key point that brief made was the importance of seeing to it that there was support for education throughout this country and especially for those people in poorer parts of Canada.

Yet, what do we find along with this budget that the government brought down and about which the minister boasted to proudly this morning? We find that this government has also cut back its transfer payments to the provinces, its Established Programs Financing which is destined to go to education. Education too, so important for our future, has been a target of this government.

Health care has been a target of this government. It comes to us to ask for \$25.5 million, and yet it has indicated in its budget no understanding of the sense of

fairness which people in this country feel, as shown by its attacks on the poorest and most vulnerable groups.

They have no sense of the importance to the future of this country of science and technology, of education and of health care. How could we possibly feel confident in supporting \$25.5 billion of borrowing by this government with such misguided and dinosaur-like views of what is important to our economic future?

We might say that at least the government is being responsible financially. The gold dust twins of the government, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, have thrown money about like there was no tomorrow right from the start of their period in power.

I looked at *The Budget Documents* which came out with the budget speech this year. They indicate very clearly—and the people of the country should be aware of it—that when this Conservative government took office the national debt of Canada as at the end of the fiscal year in 1984 was \$160 billion. As of the end of this financial year in 1990 the national debt is \$351 billion.

These great managers and tremendous business geniuses, these gold dust twins, the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, have succeeded in driving the country into a position where our national debt is twice what it was when they took power. Yet, they come to us and talk about fiscal responsibility. Their sense of fiscal responsibility has been to give massive breaks to the wealthy. For instance, they have put into effect a \$100,000 exemption for any capital gains tax. How much has that cost in terms of that huge increase in the public debt of the country?

I would like to tell you, Madam Speaker, about one of the most interesting cases I have come across that the government has put into effect. There was a small tire recycling company in Brantford, Ontario which received something in the order of \$500,000 in 1983 to get its operations going. It was a disaster. By 1989 the company had gone bankrupt and had not paid back most of the \$500,000 it had received.

What did the government do? Three days before the 1988 election the government gave to that same company \$2.2 million, not \$500,000 but \$2.2 million, for a tire factory and also to recycle tires by the same company in Cape Breton. This was despite the fact that the Department of Transport two years before had tested the tires of this company and found that 30 per cent of them were