Bankruptcy

This country was built under the free enterprise system without government subsidies. If the government now start subsidizing certain businesses, it will put others into bankruptcy. That has already happened. One company has been ruined and there are others on the way out.

A few years ago we had this policy of importing beef. We increased the amount of beef we were importing from another country. As a result, scores of our young livestock producers went bankrupt. We looked after the people in another country but we did not look after our own livestock producers in Canada. That was government policy. Hon. members can talk about causes of bankruptcy. That was a cause of a tremendous number of bankruptcies among our young farmers, those who were just starting out and trying to make a go of it, but who then found out that the government had done something with which they could not cope. Government policies are one of the causes of bankruptcies.

Deficits too are a cause of bankruptcy. It is not right to operate under continual deficits. At one time the psychology of debt was abhorred by people, but the government has made it fashionable. The government has set an example to the people of this country. The government has said to the people: "Don't pay your way; borrow, borrow, borrow, and borrow to pay the interest". That is what we are doing in Canada. A business could not stand that, but that is what we are asking people to do. No wonder there is a \$5,000 tag around the neck of every baby born in Canada. It is a disgraceful situation. However, we keep on doing this. We do not try to cut expenditures. We spent \$7 million on a useless metric system, an unwanted system. We provide subsidies to companies to put other companies built by hard work and the capital of their owners out of business.

We wonder why inflation is rampant. We buy Petrofina at double its price, which does not bring one extra gallon of oil into this country, yet we charge the people for the acquisition. I say to hon. members, justify that policy to the people of Canada, because this contributes to inflation. To those who went about the country during the last election denouncing the 18-cent increase, I say tell the people of Canada why gas costs \$1.41 a gallon today. If that is not inflation, I do not know what is. We are pouring oil on the fire of inflation. We wonder why inflation is increasing. We increase our interest rates hoping that this will put out the flame, but all the time we are just pouring more and more oil on the fire. This bill does not deal with those causes and that is my major criticism of it.

I want to deal in the time that I have left with one or two specific items. First, I want to comment on wage earners. The minister talked about a special fund being considered to which employee and employer would contribute. They would contribute ten cents or 25 cents a week or a month, whatever it was. But can anyone understand a worker being asked to contribute to a fund to save his employer from going bankrupt? I think employees in this country would laugh themselves sick if they were asked to do that. What if a person were told: "Your company might go bankrupt, so would you like to contribute 25 cents a week from your pay cheque to stop the business

from going bankrupt and so you can get some wages"? That was tried a few years ago through the compensation board. It was said to those workers injured on the job while producing for their masters who made the profits that they should pay part of the compensation. For a number of years that was done, until finally—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I must advise him that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Has my allotted 40 minutes expired?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I am informed that the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry about that because you have missed the best part of my speech.

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will not be too long. I rise in my place because I have a very special interest in this piece of legislation. Bill C-12 was introduced into this House of Commons for consideration and debate by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) who also held that portfolio in 1975 when he introduced the bill for the first time. I had just joined the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as a public servant, where I remained for the subsequent five years. During that time, this bankruptcy bill was introduced into the House and went through the Senate committee three times. In the interim period, during 1979 when the Conservative administration was in power, this very same bill was introduced, word for word, with no changes, not one comma, not one dot over an "i", not one cross on a "t", and it is the same bill which has now been introduced by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This is the honourable Senator Flynn's Conservative bill word for word. Yet for two days now the Conservative have held up approval on second reading with spurious discussion unrelated to the content of the bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Evans: This is a good piece of legislation. The Conservatives agreed with that because they introduced precisely the same bill as that which went through discussion in this House, discussion in the Senate, discussion since 1972, following reworking and redrafting. This bill has been under consideration in the public service and in Parliament for nine years. We have finally come to a point where both parties are totally agreed as to what the optimal content of the bankruptcy bill should be, and both parties, via different administrations, have within a year introduced precisely the same bill. However, we cannot seem to come to agreement in this House