

We have a simple legislative committee looking at the issue of protection of intellectual property, some protection for the inventors of this country so they do not have to sneak across the United States Border in the dark of the night to patent their inventions, so they can actually patent them in Canada, so they can produce them in Canada, creating jobs and sharing in the wealth of Canada. That was fought by the New Democratic Party and the Liberals together, the child bride and the mature adult.

You should listen to the members of the New Democratic Party in committee, Mr. Speaker. You should listen to the phrasing of the questions they ask, the repetition of the questions, and then listen to the union witnesses they bring into committee. They use the same words, the same set of ideas, the same phraseology and the same emphasis. Which is which? Which is the political Party and which is the labour organization? It is getting increasingly confusing.

Powerful unions donate a lot of money to the NDP, but they should not really be surprised to occasionally see a conflict in an Hon. Member's mind and actions. Doing what is best for the big, powerful, rich union may not be the same action one should take if one is really trying to do one's best for Canada and Canadians. Why does the NDP always choose the big unions? What about the little unions which exist in my community and the communities of all the other Hon. Members? Why just the big unions with the special arrangements for severance pay and special arrangements for paid vacations? Does the really rich union movement run the NDP or does the NDP run the unions? All we can really tell is that the money comes from those rich unions to the NDP and the speeches of members of the NDP are the same as the union leaders, the same words, the same ideas, the same evidence time after time.

To vote NDP is a dream. Some people better start to look before they make a mistake. They had better start to look at who they are voting for and what they are voting for. Sometimes one can wake up in the morning and say last night I made a mistake, and that could be the voters if they were to sort of stay asleep and simply, because they do not know anything about the NDP, perhaps vote for that Party just to get a change. I will tell you, it would be a change, Mr. Speaker. Half the people with jobs today would not have them tomorrow. That would be a change. They would not like that change, I suggest. Who would be naming the people? What set of principles would we have for the selection of people who were to get the jobs? Would an NDP Government take over all the means of production and therefore control all the jobs? Would it be its friends with the best jobs?

I find it a bit alarming at the committee studying intellectual property protection. A Deputy Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the Province of Manitoba appeared before the committee the other night. He was going to tell us what was wrong with the legislation of the Parliament of Canada in the protection of intellectual property. One of the members of the committee asked, "I listened to your words.

The Budget—Mr. Hawkes

Are you sort of active in politics? Are you a politician or are you a civil servant drawing a pay cheque from the taxpayers of your province"? I am informed that with a great deal of pride, this so-called civil servant, in public testimony before a parliamentary committee said, "I am a socialist and proud of it". That is the crew which does not have a problem with conflict of interest. There is no conflict because those who are elected own all the money and can give it to whomever they please. If that is the view of the world, how can there be a conflict? The definition of a Conservative conflict would be a competition. That is a conflict. There would be three, four, five or six groups bidding and the best bid would get it. The other five would have been in a conflict that they lost—one was in a conflict and won. If one draws a political ideology, a way of thinking, which gives unit control over people's lives and the means of productions and on and on and on, then there cannot be a conflict because there can never be a contest. In that case there is never a winner, just a whole lot of losers.

• (1410)

As I said earlier, the country was in trouble when those of us who are still here came back after 1979. The NDP and the Liberals kicked out a Budget that would have gotten us out of trouble, and got us into four more years of trouble. We have had two-and-one-half years of less trouble since coming to power. We will have another couple of years of increasingly less trouble and more good news.

Mr. Keeper: And then good-bye!

Mr. Hawkes: We will then go to the people of the country and say, take a good look at the speeches that have been made in the House over the last four years. In those speeches you have been told not to worry about the deficit. Every time a member of the Opposition makes a speech in the House he or she tells you that we must spend more and cut taxes. You are told that taxes should not be increased on anything. Is there a Canadian, a single Canadian six years of age or older anywhere in the country who does not understand that when one borrows money one pays it back with interest? If one borrows enough money then every penny one has goes to pay the interest. If it goes to pay the interest then one cannot buy a chocolate bar, a popsicle or a package of potato chips because one has nothing left with which to pay.

When I arrived in the House in 1979, some 83 cents out of every tax dollar went to programs, programs which would help people. We had 17 cents with which to pay interest. By the time we took office in September of 1984 we had but 64 cents of every dollar to spend on new programs and 36 cents with which to pay interest. We had 83 cents in 1979. We went down to 64 cents, and the figure is dropping like a rock. Before too long it would have been 50, then 40, then 30, and then 20. And then what? There would be no more money for pensions. There would be no more money for policing or for national defence. There would be no money for science and research. There would be no money for health care or education. There would be no money for anything.