

Time Allocation

Unemployment insurance is one need that is costing the Government a great deal. Do my friends opposite still argue against unemployment insurance? I remember the 1972 election campaign waged by the Conservative Party which wanted to beat the Liberals on the basis of the new unemployment insurance plan. Do they still talk of doing away with unemployment insurance? Do they put that forward as a way to cut government expenditures? If they do, they should say so. I have heard Hon. Members opposite ridicule government job-creation programs that are giving thousands of Canadians an opportunity to do something useful in their communities. If we do not want to allow the Government to borrow, if we do not want an increase in taxes, then we should obviously cut expenditures.

I have listened carefully for suggestions from the Opposition for major cuts. I have waited for the Opposition to put forward its program for the next election. I have heard the word "more". I heard that opposition Members would spend much more on national defence, I have heard that they would spend much more on research and development; I have heard that they would give more to the provinces for post-secondary education, that under the new health care Act the provinces should get more money for health care. I have heard them say they would like to do away with Canada's aerospace industry.

At the moment we know and everybody knows that it is necessary for the Government to borrow because there can be no significant cuts. Although my friends opposite rail about government spending, they know there can be no cuts in Old Age Security, the child tax credit, unemployment insurance or job-creation programs.

From whom do we borrow, Mr. Speaker? Some may think that we go offshore to borrow large sums of money. We know that is not true. Only a small amount of money is borrowed offshore; most of it is borrowed from Canadians who have large amounts of savings. The Government borrows these savings and uses them for growth and development and the humanization of our society. I find it difficult to believe that if Hon. Members opposite were in government they would not want to continue with most of this and would come asking us for the right to borrow money.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to enter this debate. When I was asked to stand down in favour of my colleague in the New Democratic Party, I did it in favour of history. Years from now, when people ask me what the New Democratic Party stood for in Parliament, I want to be able to say that in its last year, 1984, I assisted it in participating in the proceedings in the House.

I should say that I am sorry to participate in this closure debate. No one likes closure. I want to refer to some of the speeches that have been made, however, particularly that of the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner).

Like many Members on this side of the House, I was shocked to hear the Hon. Member come down squarely in defence of the collection practices of the Department of National Revenue. When he goes back to his riding I think he will

find that the people there are not very impressed with his defence of the auditing and collection techniques of the Department of National Revenue.

There certainly are big needs in the country, Mr. Speaker—the need of Maislin Transport for \$34 million, or the big need to rent the Centennial Tower so that we can lease three out of fifteen floors. That is the kind of need the Liberal Party has developed over the years.

I do not want to say that the previous speaker lied when he said that this party was in favour of doing away with the aircraft industry, because that would be unparliamentary; I would only say that he has come as close to the truth as one can without actually lying.

Let us get down to real facts now, Mr. Speaker, and why the Liberal Party wants closure. Why did it bring in closure on this Bill? I think there are two or three reasons for that. The first is that the Liberal Party is feeling the heat throughout the country because of its mismanagement of the economy. There is increasing unemployment in Canada. Someone had the nerve to refer to the problems of the U.S. economy. One of its problems is that it has only 7.8 per cent unemployment; we have an 11.3 per cent unemployment rate. We keep bringing this to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), who obviously has no answers, so the Government decided to cut debate. But closure is the problem of the Liberal Party.

● (1600)

Let us deal with the specifics, the leadership campaign. Five out of the six candidates for the leadership of the Liberal Party were directly involved in the creation of the deficit, to pay for which we must borrow. Those are the people going out across the country explaining to Canadians how different it is going to be if they are only chosen in the next election. This debate on the borrowing of more money is of supreme embarrassment to those leadership candidates. It is no wonder they want closure enforced so the debate can come off the floor of the House of Commons.

Let us talk about the other candidate, the one out of the six who is not a Member of Parliament, that colleague of the Members opposite who quit and went back to practise law on Bay Street at \$300,000 a year. Let us talk about that candidate who is now going to come back and save the country by running for the leadership of the Liberal Party. It is that candidate, Mr. Speaker, who started the trend of deficit in the first place. He also wants closure on this Bill. He wants it out of the House of Commons.

I did not have an opportunity to speak in the original debate because closure was brought forward. I am pleased to have this opportunity now to speak to just exactly what the Government is doing. It is trying to borrow some \$29 billion to fund runaway spending.

The Bill contains a contingency fund which is far more than it needs. What bothers us on this side, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that when deficits are projected, they never seem to be able to get the figure right. The projected deficits are always increased when it comes down to the final facts. The govern-