

*Borrowing Authority*

I say, Sir, be a regional or a parochial policy. International trade and resource development are national issues—national pocketbook issues, I might say.

Now, the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association reports that in December of last year employment reached a ten-year low of 8,500 people, a drop of some 5,700 people or 40 per cent of their work force. In one area alone, namely the Atlantic trawler fleet, there is a need for ship replacement over the next ten years which will mean over \$3 billion worth of shipbuilding work. Much of this will be lost to Canadian industry unless there is a change in the present policy which encourages domestic fishing operators to buy offshore. Not a single fishing vessel was ordered from Canadian yards in 1982. However, five were imported for a total of 27 trawlers brought in since 1979.

Our ability, Sir, to compete in world markets, our ability to control and protect our resources, impinges directly on the economic well-being of the nation as a whole. National marine policies which touch on such issues are as important to the people of Alberta or the people of Saskatchewan as they are to the people of Shelburne, Nova Scotia, or Liverpool, or Bridgewater or Lunenburg or Halifax. I say, Sir, that the national interest must come first. We must not confuse, for example, the laudable desire to build ships in Canada or create a fleet carrying the Canadian flag with the need first to get our goods to market in the most cost effective and efficient manner possible.

● (1610)

The objective in shipping, and I speak here with some experience, is to move cargo and not just to sail ships. The creation of a Canadian technology that would help support and control northern and offshore resource development presumes by definition the manufacture of made at home solutions to our problems. Perhaps what we should do in this area, in the short term at least, is to make it financially attractive for Canadians who now own vessels flying foreign flags to register those ships at home.

A national marine policy must be pragmatic, flexible and designed to encourage a range of responses to what I perceive is a wide range of challenges. There is no doubt in my mind that we are equal to the task of creating a policy which constitutes an optimum response to the marine problems which, I submit, now confront us.

I realize that the creation of such a policy will require that the task become something more of a national interest than I perceive it to be at present. But the fact that the time we have in which to act on these problems is rapidly growing short may provide the necessary sense of urgency.

Meanwhile, I am personally comforted by the fact that twice before in its history, this country that we all love so well, this Canada of ours, has been a major seafaring power and, in

my opinion, there is absolutely no reason why we cannot become one for the third time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Questions and comments? Debate.

**Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to rise and speak on Bill C-151, an Act to provide supplementary borrowing authority. However, I find it irresponsible that the Government finds it necessary, after the introduction of a budget, to ask for a \$4 billion padding to an already out of control deficit.

This particular Bill is one in a long line of borrowing Bills. In this session of Parliament we have witnessed Bills C-30, C-59, C-111, C-125, C-128, C-143, and now we have Bill C-151.

In its April budget, the Government had the opportunity to indicate its fiscal requirements. Now it has chosen to seek more money after the fact, for some purpose it will not reveal to Parliament, a cushion of \$2 billion for this year and a \$2 billion pork barrel for the future.

One thing is certain with this Government, for every \$3 that it spends it must borrow \$1. Government Members state that one must borrow to stimulate. There is no stimulation in this borrowing, only regression.

In an atmosphere of mistrust, one must examine where some of the funds now being requested will go. It is clear from the Government's action that the employment situation and the future employment prospects will remain dismal for at least two million unemployed in this country for at least the next foreseeable few years. At precisely a time when recovery should be encouraged, a series of regressive tax measures are scheduled to pay for the enormous deficit that this Government has inflicted on Canadians. We will spend the first 18 months of economic recovery going back to square one.

One of the principal aspects of the Government's special recovery program is the so-called Special Recovery Projects of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) which are to be funded at \$2.2 billion over the next four years. Only \$1.5 billion of this represents new spending, of which \$460 million is expected to be spent in the 1983-84 fiscal year. No project in this program can be under way until at least October of 1983. The impact upon the unemployed in Canada will therefore be delayed at least that long.

Unlike most Canadians, the Liberals do not understand that they have to pay as they go. Heavy borrowing and Government projections place a majority of tax increases in place for sometime after the next federal election. It is a deliberate attempt to stifle an incoming Government and to reduce the range of options it will be able to undertake to put this country back on the road to recovery. Instead of real job creation and deficit control, the Government is increasing net future tax increases totalling \$5.7 billion over the next four years and deficits totalling more than \$102 billion between now and 1986.