

that they can build families and futures. What trust has the Government earned from the 14.2 per cent record unemployment in Waterloo region, as reported by Statistics Canada last month? These 22,000 people, out of an area work force of 152,000 cannot be expected to trust the spending habits of a Government which has overseen its record reliance on jobless benefits and welfare.

In the last 15 years, Government spending has risen at an unprecedented rate of 59 per cent, a sad commentary on those who support the Government for practising restraint. For every \$4 it spends, the Government must now borrow \$1, and the borrowed money must still be paid for. The cost of interest on the debt during the last fiscal year was forecast at \$16.7 billion, the equivalent of one revenue dollar in three. Is it any wonder that our young Canadians look with concern to their future? Is there not some point at which responsible representatives must say, "I will no longer give carte blanche to a Government which has no compunction about mortgaging the future of my children and their children's children." Yet the Government, in its hunger for more and more money to spend, refuses to listen to smart spending suggestions.

It has already agreed, in the person of the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal), that this country's voluntary sector can create lasting jobs by spending far less of the taxpayer's money. The Government admits that it must spend an estimated \$120,000, while the voluntary sector has already demonstrated, as the Secretary of State has admitted, that it can create the same job for just between \$35,000 and \$40,000. Even the proven capacity of the voluntary sector to train and retrain unemployed Canadians in new job skills remains virtually ignored, untapped, by the Government's own admission. Its answer is, "We can do it ourselves", and in terms of the future of the country, it states, "We will not stimulate either the private or the voluntary sector".

In this morning's *Globe and Mail*, under the heading "Ottawa, business warning to deliberate spending boost", in a column by Thomas Walkom, we see these comments:

There are two levels of objection to Government deficits. The usual economic criticism is that deficits soak up savings that otherwise might be used by private borrowers. This process, called crowding out, is said to force up interest rates. At the limit, this criticism blends into the monetarism of U.S. economist Milton Friedman, which holds that increased spending for lower taxes don't help the economy anyway and that governments should concentrate on the growth of the money supply.

The article continues:

The other level of objection to Government deficits is more fundamental. It is based on the view that nations, like corner stores, should balance their books and pay their debts. This is a view founded on a profound mistrust of government as an economic actor. It is virtually untouched by the ephemeral winds of economic boom and depression.

In conclusion, in opposing the Bill, let me say that we are faced with a Government which has abandoned the concept of a balanced budget, and we are faced with a Government which is not prepared to clean up its own act. Therefore, I and many others in this House cannot trust the Government with \$19 billion for which it will give us no design as to how it will be spent.

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, we often start by talking about the pleasure of speaking, but it is certainly not a pleasure to speak one more time on one more borrowing Bill. The Government, drunk with mismanagement, is asking for another \$19 billion, \$5 billion for this fiscal year, and another \$14 billion for which there is not even a plan. There is no budget and no stated intention as to how that money is to be spent. What we have in front of us is simply a request, a request under the threat of closure.

The Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Mosquito—

Mr. Nystrom: He's a real bug.

Mr. Malone: —or Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), said to us a little while ago that following King Charles, the purpose of this Parliament was to control the King's purse. This Parliament has lost such control. Parliament does no longer control the finances of this country. We are under the threat of closure to borrow money and we are under closure to spend money.

I see that Your Honour is rising. May I call it six o'clock and continue tomorrow?

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—ZIMBABWE—OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a large investment in the success of the experiment in democracy in Zimbabwe. If we take our minds back two years or more to the great Lancaster House Agreement, we will recall that Canada, along with many of the other nations of the world, wished the very best for that country, which had endured a great struggle for its independence, in its great experiment in democracy. For us in Canada it was an affront to our sense of representative Government to have a minority ruling the majority. So we invested in that great transition from a minority ruling the majority. We invested by sending one of our key representatives over there to monitor the election, Mr. Gordon Fairweather, our Commissioner of Human Rights. He came back with the report that as far as he could determine the elections had gone very well considering the relative upheavals in the country. He was satisfied that the elections themselves were democratic. As the headlines of that day indicated, Mr. Fairweather came back with an emotional appeal for quick aid to Zimbabwe. That aid was forthcoming. Something like \$1.3 billion in aid was