

Borrowing Authority Act

approve the borrowing of \$18 billion, I do not think people would consider that to be hasty or unrealistic. I think, Sir, you can anticipate two or three speakers from our Party, and I suspect my colleagues in the Liberal Party will do the same thing.

Having said some complimentary things about my colleague in the Liberal Party, I would be remiss not to mention that we are being asked to borrow extra money, not because of Liberal Members of Parliament—that would be unfair to them and their integrity—but because some of their colleagues in the Senate decided it was in the best interests of the country to hold up approval of the previous borrowing authority, Bill C-11, for \$12 billion.

● (1530)

As a result, that cost the taxpayers of Canada an extra \$15 million. When we talk about multibillion dollar budgets, \$15 million may not sound like a lot of money. However, \$15 million in extra charges, which the Members of the House of Commons were not prepared to levy, would have provided a whole set of child care centres and a wide set of opportunities to build and put into place transition homes for battered women or abused children. I could go on and on with a whole variety of areas in which that \$15 million would have enabled us to perform a number of measures as a Parliament.

When we were asked by the Minister of Finance to authorize the borrowing of \$18.2 billion, we heard in the same presentation, and more recently in the budget presentation, that the Government has launched itself in a new direction. We heard that there is a new era beginning for Canada and that the Government will be handling matters quite differently from now on. We have been told that we will be seeing new approaches, new directions and new developments.

Those are certainly great terms, and we welcome them. Indeed, we do. The one item I found absent from the Budget and, therefore, I think of concern to all Members of Parliament when we authorize the borrowing of \$18.2 billion, was the apparent lack of a clear direction for the country.

To put that into context, and to be fair to the Members of the Conservative Party, what I think the Budget said is that we are now turning our attention totally to the private sector in order to create the 1.5 million jobs required in this country over the next number of years. We do not expect it to happen next month, or even this year. However, by unleashing the private sector, by giving it a variety of tax breaks, by giving individuals who make their living through investments, we are now looking to the private sector—the small, medium and large businesses of Canada—to provide the bulk, if not the entirety, of those 1.5 million jobs, in order to provide opportunities for the unemployed.

If you like, that is an approach to job creation. It is a somewhat different approach than what we have had in the past. I emphasize the word "somewhat". When you look at what Mr. MacEachen did in his Budget and consider what he said he was going to do, and when you consider what Mr. Lalonde did in his Budget and consider what he said he was

going to do, I think the two said the same thing. In effect, they said they were going to give a great many tax breaks to upper income earners. They said that a number of tax breaks will be given to the business and corporate sectors in the anticipation of creating jobs. We have tried that, Mr. Speaker. However, this measure has taken us just a bit closer to the extreme.

That is not a direction for the country. It is a process. It leaves me to ask the question, what direction has the Government provided for the textile and footwear industries of Canada? If we were to interview people involved in that business and ask what direction this sector will take over the next decade, what would people say? What would people involved in the telecommunications and aerospace sectors say when asked the same question? I do not think there is a clear vision coming out of the Budget, or even out of subsequent discussions.

What is the situation with respect to the forest sector? This is a sector which touches every province and territory in this country. Where are we going with respect to the forest industry? I am speaking now of pulp and paper, plywood and lumber, the manufacture of shingles and shakes. Are we expanding in these vital areas? Are we rationalizing these industries? Are we cutting back?

It is not clear. What is clear is that some countries, such as Sweden and Finland, are developing resource industries such as forestry. For every tree which is cut down in those countries, three more are planted. Then, over time, the three trees are thinned out to ensure that for every tree cut down a good, strong tree is grown to replace it.

We have a different approach in this country. We cut down three trees and plant one. We are still doing that in spite of recent developments. Again, one asks where are we going with respect to the forest industry?

What is the situation with respect to fishing, whether it be the East Coast, inland or West Coast fishery? What will be the situation with respect to the fishing industry in Canada over the next number of years? At this point, I look to my colleague from Newfoundland, where fishing plays such an important role. I am forced to ask where the Newfoundland fishery will be at the end of this decade. Will it be healthy? Will it be rationalized and, in parts, phased out? Where are we in terms of fish farming and aquaculture? Again, there is no direction, no vision, no blueprint, no strategy for such a critical resource industry in this Budget. There is absolutely nothing.

One could go on and on. I think one of the most important industries any country has, particularly a country such as Canada, is the agricultural sector, the food processing sector. In every province and territory there is a certain amount of that life-critical sector, food production. What is our game plan in Canada with respect to this sector? Is it to become self-sufficient in the critical areas over the next decade or two? Is it to develop more exports in agriculture? The present Government has canned Canagrex and said that the Crown corporation whose business it is to open up new export markets for our food producers is not needed. In terms of agriculture, are we trying to preserve the family farm as the agricultural