

As to home owners, clearly this insurance does not protect and create houses. It protects people against huge rises in interest rates but that does not help the ordinary guy who is going into the market to buy a property because he has to pay the current rate. All he can do is protect himself against further increases, so that does not help a bit. As rates go higher, it drives people out of business and into bankruptcy.

However, one of the estimates we have before us now, Mr. Speaker, concerns advances to de Havilland and Canadair. In the last 15 months we will have advanced to those corporations a total of \$1.250 billion. Those corporations together have 2,709 employees, which represents \$173,600 for each job in the last 15 months. Does the Hon. Member think that is responsible? Does he really think that he as a Member of Parliament can justify going into the marketplace and bidding up interest rates at a time when the Canadian dollar is falling? How does he expect us to account to our children and grandchildren in order to justify this kind of activity?

**Mr. Parent:** Mr. Speaker, the question the Hon. Member asks should be couched in other terms. Yes, we are dealing with economics, with money, no question about it. However, it was not very long ago that we in Canada had a massive brain drain where a great number of our engineers in the aerospace industry left the country. This is what we are talking about at Canadair and de Havilland. I know the Hon. Member was not part of the government at the time, he was not a Member of Parliament, but it was his Party which finished off the Avro Arrow. This place would have put us in the forefront of the aviation industry. It was 20 years ahead of its time. And so ashamed were we of that act, Mr. Speaker, that the government of the day saw fit to destroy all information that we ever had on the Arrow.

● (1240)

If you were to ask whether I believe that the aerospace industry in Canada is worth investing in and tiding over until times are better, my answer would be yes. If it means that at this juncture we must invest the amounts of money we are investing into these businesses to keep them going, to ensure that our children will have a chance in these industries and in all of the high technology jobs which spin off, my answer is that it is worth that type of investment for us as a nation.

**Mr. Thacker:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the question of the deficit to the Hon. Member in a different way. In 1968, 5 per cent to 10 per cent of tax revenue went to service the debt. Since 1968 it has risen to 10, 15, 20, 25 and now over 30 per cent of tax revenue used to service the debt. That means it is going into the hands of people who already have wealth and we must tax the middle class to get that money.

Where would the Hon. Member cut it off? When it was 10 per cent we were saying it was high enough. When it was 20 per cent we were really angry. Now it is over 30 per cent and we are inflamed. If it was okay at 20 per cent and 30 per cent, why should it not be at 60 per cent or 70 per cent? Where would the Hon. Member cut it off?

### *Borrowing Authority Act*

**Mr. Parent:** Mr. Speaker, on the face of it that would seem to be a very reasonable question. I wish I had an answer but I do not. The only answer I could give would seem evasive. I guess it is whatever the Canadian people can bear, whatever they can do to carry this debt. If I were to say I do not believe it is high at 30 per cent, I would not be telling the truth.

There are other nations, including Japan and Germany, where more of the money taken in is used to pay their debt than we are paying now. They seem to be surviving. Also, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the question period has terminated.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate this morning by the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. In a moment or two I would like to make some observations about the points being made by Hon. Members.

I cannot help but ask a rather fundamental question, Mr. Speaker. Imagine the scenario of a small business person or other individual walking into a banker's office to take out a loan. The individual wants to take out a \$29,500 loan. The banker asks what the money will be spent on and how seriously the matter has been thought out. The individual says how he will spend \$25,500 because he has been spending that amount year after year and just wants to top up what he has always been spending. He has not given it a fair evaluation. The banker asks what the other \$4,000 will be spent on. The individual indicates that he just threw that in case he might need it for something in the future and he will be checking it out.

If you were a banker, Mr. Speaker, would you consider allotting that extra \$4,000 when the individual has no idea how he is going to spend it, only that he may have some use for it in the future? During very tight financial times I do not think anyone as a banker would throw that in with enthusiasm.

**Mr. Blais:** You do not understand very much, do you Nelson?

**Mr. Riis:** Bill C-21 asks us to do this as responsible parliamentarians. It requests authorization to borrow \$29.550 billion. This includes a \$4 billion contingency fund for things which may come up in the future. This is the largest borrowing Bill in Canadian history, Mr. Speaker. It is only a thin page but it will lock the country into an incredible amount of spending. I will come back to that in a moment.

**Mr. Blais:** Nelson, it is an authority. It is to authorize the spending.

**Mr. Riis:** That is right. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Blais) says it is to authorize the borrowing and spending of this money as required. That is what it is.

**Mr. Blais:** It does not lock anybody into anything.