

develop and grow. But here is a government which has adopted for a dozen years now the notion, not that citizens should be given the incentive to build, to manufacture and to have a kind of growing mentality which says, "let us make this country into something great", but instead has stooped to say, "let us borrow more money, not to generate more wealth so that we could be richer both in our private lives and in government, but to run to the international marketplace to borrow and on the basis of that borrowing to look after our social needs."

One of my experiences gleaned from being a member of Parliament is that I do not think it matters very much if you are a Liberal, a New Democrat or a Conservative in terms of being able to identify a problem in the country. When any member of a party looks at a problem, he tends to see it. If we note that the native people of Canada are not satisfactorily housed, I believe that, regardless whether we are Liberal, NDP or Conservative, we all see the fact that they are not satisfactorily housed. The difference between political parties is how we respond to the question. We find it to be the tradition of Liberal members of the House that instead of allowing this country to grow in an exciting and beautiful way so as to match the country's potential, they have taken the strong centralist government notion of, first, controlling and, second, of believing that we have reached our limits of growth in the country and that all we can do now is to simply borrow further in the international markets and make ourselves more and more dependent on the deficits being created.

We are now spending \$15 billion a year more than this government collects in taxes. I do not expect, for a moment, that any citizen who is aware of that fact will not say simply that at first sight this is a situation we cannot tolerate today, nor can we tolerate its extension year after year, because citizens of this country know they cannot run their farms, their corner grocery stores, or Stelco or Chrysler or any other corporation, if there is not a sense of balance between what you do, what you earn and what you spend. Yet somehow this regime in 1968 came in under that great new something who swept the nation in 1968, looking like the hon. member for sanctimony. He came to the public of Canada which believed he was the answer. He probably came out of the new line of economics which is often referred to—

**An hon. Member:** Keynes.

**Mr. Malone:** Yes, the Keynesian theory. It was on the tip of my tongue but I did not have a tongue quite as long as do some others. But the Keynesian theory is somehow the belief that if you always save money, your system will not grow. Keynes' idea was that if the government were allowed to spend that money for you, the private sector would not have to do that spending. I think that theory has been put to rest, and with it should go the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and all the people in the Liberal party.

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

**Mr. Malone:** Somehow they have the notion that we can tax the people, take their money, spend it as we wish, and then

### *Borrowing Authority Act*

when we do not have it, borrow more and go into debt. I think it would be worth while for Canadians to know the extent of debt they are being put into, because the debt of today's government, if we take the perspective that debts must be paid, is over \$3,000 for every man, woman and child in the country. Interestingly enough, for a family of four, in just three years time, there will be a family debt of some \$20,000 built up by the federal Government of Canada. This will become the albatross and the cement blocks around the necks of the children of the future.

I think it is quite one thing to say that we need certain social policies and, therefore, we are going to stand by them because our hearts are big and they bleed for the people of Canada. I think it is quite a different thing to say that we all in this House have a social conscience. You do not have to be a socialist to have a social conscience. Surely, in doing that which we call the common good for the country, we are not just running back to the international trough and saying, "fill it up again," especially in Canada where we have the resources to make the country work and to earn the kind of a life standard we all want.

I would like to diverge for a moment to say that Canadians can surely do that, because if you take a country like Japan, with 110 million people, having only the resources of fish and tin and having zero unemployment and one of the highest economic standards in the world, why is it that this country, with all the resources, all of the blessings of educated people, with the talent of a democratic system and court system, cannot put it together?

**An hon. Member:** We have a Liberal government.

**Mr. Malone:** Well, my colleague says we have a Liberal government. It is amazing how liberal it is when it goes looking to the international trough. I have been here, as I said, some six years. All I know is that, just looking at this decade, 1970-71, the federal government came before the Parliament and asked for borrowing authority for some \$3 billion. Then they came back for borrowing authority for another \$3 billion. In 1972-73, they wanted another \$3 billion, and in 1974 they came for another \$3 billion. Note that in the first four years of this decade they needed \$3 billion each time they came. Thereafter, in 1974, they wanted \$5.5 billion, then \$6 billion in 1975-76. In 1977 they needed another \$6 billion. Then in that great year of 1977-78 they wanted \$28 billion, and now in 1978-79 they want another \$28 billion. They say that this bill requests borrowing authority for 1980-81. They are after \$12 billion now. There is absolutely no guarantee this is the last time this year they are coming back to Parliament. If past experience counts for anything, they will be back to the trough again saying they need more money. The simplest thing that Canadians can ask for and that Parliament should expect is that there be no granting or borrowing of money unless the government is willing to show accountability for the money they are given.

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