

### *Depositors Compensation*

It will inevitably breed a continuation of the unfortunate failures which have occurred.

The report does not even leave out those precious depositors about whom we have been talking in this House as a reason for passing this Bill, such as universities and municipalities. The report attacks depositors, such as universities, municipalities and school boards that had money in failed institutions. It says that the prevalence of these "presumably sophisticated depositors" among the claimants of ill-fated banks "is testimony to the fact that sophistication in deposit making consists in reaching for the highest possible return in blind indifference to the soundness of the institutions.

The report says that only depositors up to \$20,000 should be insured and that those depositing larger amounts, up to \$80,000, should only receive only partial payment.

**Mr. McDermid:** Shame.

**Mr. Penner:** The Hon. Member opposite says shame. Surely to God it is not a shame to report on a document by a task force funded by the Ontario Government that has been deeply concerned about the failure of financial institutions. That is its recommendation.

My constituents concur with it. After all, the Government is reaching into their pockets and it is going to reach deeper into their pockets in the new year with the income tax increases that are coming out of the May 23 Budget. They resent it. People work hard for their money in the mines, in the bush and in the papermills or driving transport trucks, and now you are asking them to pay out to wealthy depositors, who are not known to us, unknown amounts of money. My constituents tell me to stand up and fight. That is what I am doing. I am fighting and I am objecting. Eight hundred and seventy-five dollars and maybe more will be paid out.

At the same time, in my constituency there is less money for direct job creation to municipalities to create jobs, to get projects done that would help those municipalities. Volunteer organizations are getting nothing. Consequently, there are thousands of people who will not be able to qualify this winter for unemployment insurance.

What will those people do, Mr. Speaker? They will be put on the welfare rolls of municipalities. Here is the Government opposite saying you have to pass this billion dollar Bill because it is concerned about poor municipalities. If it really cared about municipalities, the Government would be doing something about job creation for municipalities. This is the same Government that, when it took office, downgraded regional development programs. The Government does not believe in regional development programs. We have heard that from the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens). He said for a long time that that is not a responsibility of government. I have heard him say many times that that is nothing but statism. He does not even know the history of Canada. This country was built on regional development policies. If we had not had those policies for a long period of time, we would not even have a nation.

● (1630)

The Government claims that we must pass this Bill because it is concerned about municipalities and credit unions that are losing large amounts of money every day. They wonder if we on this side do not have any concern and sympathy for them. If that is really the concern of Government members, let us bring in a Bill to deal exclusively with those who are in need from among those depositors. Let us determine need and then let us pay them.

**Mr. McDermid:** Who's going to determine that?

**Mr. Penner:** We determine that by knowing who they are and by having the facts on the table. You people have forgotten that Parliament operates on the basis of facts and information. We cannot operate on the basis of secrecy with everything hidden. That is the way this Government is functioning.

**Mr. McDermid:** What happened to your belief in universality?

**Mr. Penner:** Another reason why I will not support this Bill is because Parliament was misled by the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) who said that if we would support the bail-out, the Canadian Commercial Bank would be put back on its feet and the Government of Canada would get its money back. On the basis of that, we went along with the Minister. Things did not work out that way. The bank failed, another bank failed and now we have to bail out depositors who had deposits in excess of \$60,000. These are well-to-do depositors. We are not talking about poor people here. We are talking about people who have deposits in excess of \$60,000 and we are supposed to bail them out.

The truth is that the word "incompetency" must apply here. The Government got involved in the money market but it did not understand what it was doing. The House of Commons was misled, but perhaps it was not deliberate because the Minister, using the best information she had, was quite confident that the Canadian Commercial Bank would be viable. However, it failed. In the British parliamentary system, that would mean someone's resignation.

Perhaps the Minister of State for Finance is not the person who should resign because if the stories are true, she resisted strongly the bail-out package. I think those stories are probably true. I have spoken to the Minister and I regard her as being knowledgeable about these matters. She probably put up a good argument against it. However, she was overruled by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). Of course, we cannot call for the resignation of the Prime Minister but certainly the Minister of Finance is the one who ought to go because of this situation. Has there been any talk about resignation? No, none whatsoever.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Penner:** Hon. Members opposite applaud. They should keep applauding. I hope they have something to applaud about the next time they go to the people.