

seeking markets to establish their foothold, often in competition with larger companies from the United States and elsewhere. I think that is an important and appropriate role for Government, but it is characteristic, I regret to say, of the outlook of that Member's Party that somehow when you have a good idea which appears to have the potential for very serious economic return, the first place you look at is Government.

We cannot continue to have Government trying to play the role of risk capitalists, venture capitalists, and entrepreneurs. We have serious problems in parts of our country where there are not any natural markets, where there is difficulty in attracting business. That is why our funds for regional economic development are so important.

The question that the Hon. Member asked is a complex one. Is he suggesting that Government should take the whole responsibility? We have programs and we are quite willing to play a role to encourage local technologies. We have many programs throughout Government, including through the Ministry of the Environment, to encourage a development of new environmental technologies. In fact, that was one of the themes that was discussed in the Throne Speech.

However, what I am talking about today, the problem of the debt and the presence of the Government as a major borrower in capital markets, relates directly to the issue that the Hon. Member raises, that people look to Government to resolve the problem that Government in its indebtedness has created. That is, a scarcity of capital available for private industry in this country.

Ms. Langan: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for her speech. I was quite heartened when she noted at the beginning of her speech that this Budget deals with poverty. I was waiting to hear just how this Budget deals with poverty in a positive way. She related the sad reality of the new deficit in the treadmill we are in, and asked whether this enormous debt should be our legacy to future generations. She discussed a baby with a ball and chain in a *Globe and Mail* ad, and referred to it as the fiscal ball and chain, which suggests that maybe the attitude of this Government is one that children should indeed shoulder the burden of the debt today and not worry about the future.

The Budget—Ms. K. Campbell

I would like to ask several questions. The Hon. Member referred to training programs and said that we cannot afford to take women out of the workforce. In the same breath she said the third prong of child care is on hold. My question is, can we afford to take the risk with the lack of good child care, the cutting back of social programs, and the impact that those will have as we go through the next number of years, as these children work their way through their childhood and early adulthood and are faced with lack of supervision, lack of social support, and for example, a tax increase including matters like family counselling, when we are talking about taxing back.

I ask the Hon. Member, what will be the impact on society of those program cuts. She talked about removing the legacy of debt and said that it is easy to borrow from our children's future because they have no voice in vote. I have said in this House and I raise it again that it is always easy to steal from today's children and their programs because they have no voice in vote.

I would like to ask the Hon. Member why the choice was social programs, not corporate tax programs that will affect all profit making companies, all 89,000 of them, I might add, including the banks.

Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of questions in the Hon. Member's comment. I will try to deal with the ones that I think are most crucial. As to the last comment about corporate taxation, I am curious to know whether the Member's Party takes the view that there should not be the loss carry-overs allowed for corporations. That is another question.

• (1140)

In the Budget Speech, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) indicated very clearly that the Government will act to meet its objectives in child care by the end of this mandate. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said when he introduced the child care bill in the last Parliament, which was not acted on by the Senate, we cannot do in four years what has not been done in 20 years. The federal Government's financial commitment to child care remains quite considerable, remembering that all of the child care subsidies existing throughout the country are shared 50-50 with the federal Government. Enormous amounts of federal money go into child care.