

Supplementary Borrowing Authority

• (2120)

Mr. Blaikie: What about the \$6.5 billion for the oil companies that you voted for?

Mr. Blenkarn: You have been around here a long time, Mr. Speaker, and you know as well as I do that there are a host of things that are nonessential.

Mr. Fisher: Give us an idea what you are talking about.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, my friend asked me to give him an idea of what we are talking about. Perhaps he would like to tell me how really essential the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is. How really essential is that, when we have people who cannot pay the mortgage on their home, who cannot buy food for the table? How imperative is it that a government spend money to entertain people at the Grey Cup Game? Is that the kind of thing we should be spending money on when people cannot pay their bills and in many cases cannot get welfare? Is that the kind of spending we should be directing the Government of Canada to make? I say to the Parliamentary Secretary that there are a great number of things and he knows them—

Mr. Fisher: Let us have some more.

Mr. Blenkarn: Oh, you want a quick one? Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that the other day one of the planes owned by Transport Canada was parked illegally at the Ottawa Airport. The people in the Department of Transport did not like that and they were running the airport, so they imposed a fine of \$50 for illegal parking. The airport is owned by the Department of Transport and the plane is owned by the Department of Transport, so one part of the Department took another part of the Department to court and spent \$2,000 on legal fees to determine which part of the Department should pay a fine!

That is the kind of thing you do. You laugh. You know where the waste is. That is the kind of thing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member knows that his remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. Blenkarn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let us get on to some things which are positive. Let us go on to consider what we can do to clean up some of the problems we have.

First of all, I think the Government must be commended for taking note yesterday of the suggestions made in the report of the Finance Committee with respect to the Income Tax Act. A number of changes were made that I think will be helpful. I refer particularly to the health plans, the change in northern benefits, cleaning up to some extent the problem of the 12.5 per cent dividend tax, cleaning up the problem with respect to taxing work in progress for professionals and, particularly, the delay with respect to the ill-thought out sales tax plan. But there are a number of other things that must be done and that were not thought out properly. These positive suggestions must be made to the Government.

First of all, we must completely examine the unemployment insurance situation. Unemployment insurance premiums represent a regressive payroll tax. They are anti-employee. What we are trying to do is to put people back to work, and one thing you do not do when you want to put people back to work is make it more expensive to hire people.

The effect of the budget change yesterday was to increase the tax on hiring people a total of \$5.52 for each \$100 of insurable earnings. That payroll burden is unrealistic. It is damaging to employment. It is the kind of thing that must be rethought. This Parliament must come to grips with unemployment insurance and with what we really can afford in terms of unemployment insurance. We must have a parliamentary inquiry into that problem and into the proper financing of unemployment insurance, particularly in these difficult times when tax money, or even borrowed money for that matter, from the general revenues will have to be used to make sure that people have enough earning power to pay their ordinary household bills. This matter is serious and essential. It is imperative that the Government come to grips with it and trust Parliament again as, to some extent, it trusted Parliament with respect to the study of the Income Tax Act.

Second, the Government must come to grips with the whole question of bail-out. We have seen the Government invest \$125 million in Massey-Ferguson this year. We have seen the Government guarantee loans of \$1.3 billion to Canadair and \$4.50 billion to de Havilland. We have seen the Government decide, for some strange reason and without rationale at all, to back Maislin Transport. In the last week we have seen the Government seemingly get together—and without parliamentary approval, I might add—to do something for Dome Petroleum. There is a further \$400 million in the budget which presumably is to be split between de Havilland and Canadair.

We have to look at these borrowings and seriously consider where these Crown corporations are going and where we as a country are going with this bail-out problem. Are we really saving jobs or are we costing the country jobs? When we take money out of the country, from the productive side where it could increase employment, and use it to bail out people who are obviously incapable of running a business profitably, we are probably costing the country jobs, not saving jobs. If these bail-outs are to continue, what we are really doing is saying to those who are productive and capable that they are going to pay taxes to those who are incapable. That does not improve the productivity of Canada, Mr. Speaker. That does not secure permanent and honest and good employment. That is the kind of thing that is anti-employment and anti-productive.

Before any more money is spent—and that includes the \$400 million further bail-out money to Canadair and de Havilland—it is absolutely necessary that this advance of money by the Government to corporations cease, whether they be private corporations or Crown corporations. If those corporations cannot stand on their own feet they must be examined in detail by Parliament. The fact is that what we are