

### *Government Orders*

was \$167.985 billion. The national debt in 1984 was \$168 billion, approximately.

Our national debt today is skyrocketing over \$400 billion which is well over 100 per cent increase. We hear week after week that it is because of the interest rates they had to pay back in 1984. Their spending was in excess of \$30 billion beyond the revenues collected. They had to pay a national debt on interest of \$22 billion which they attribute to past governments.

It is very clear in my mind that they not only spent \$30 billion beyond the tax dollars they collected, but they did not point out at the same time that the government amounts received had increased to the point at which they have raised taxes since 1984 until today approximately one-third more than were available then.

If I were to take the government revenues in 1984 they were \$64 billion. Today they are \$128 billion. If I look at the government expenditures in 1984 they were \$96 billion. Today they are \$148 billion.

The government has spent a great deal of money on various programs and done many things it felt were directions it should carry out, but it did not consider where it was spending money or who it was supporting.

I have some real concerns that tax increases have been tremendous, that revenues have increased dramatically over the last six or seven years. At the same time the revenues increased it has built a \$30 billion debt year after year on top of that. The end result is we are now sitting with an accumulated debt of well over \$400 billion.

We do not have money to support programs that need to be supported and the government is saying it is fiscally responsible by cutting moneys that need to be spent on the poor in this country today, on welfare programs which are there to support most of our communities.

When I realize that it is just transferring that responsibility on to the provinces and on to the municipalities then I wonder what type of manager it really is. I believe that if it were responsible, the government would stop and look at the real basis for the programs it has.

• (1710)

I believe at this point that the government should start to examine how those overexpenditures are being created. We have to question whether building buildings or other projects under way are the things to do. Should

we be dealing with the poor, the weaker people in the economy, ensuring that education goes well, that lunch programs and schools go well, that those people who are having a very difficult time have the basic devices of life so that they can learn and increase their ability to be citizens in this community and are able to give as much as they can?

The direction we are moving in with this bill is retarding the ability of a great of number of people in this society to do the best that they can do. The problem is that we are not looking to the future. Presently we are looking at saving a few dollars, which create tremendous costs in the future.

Uneducated people, poorly nourished people who cannot learn, are going to be the children of the future if we do not change some of the things that are going on.

It is clearly evident that government has been very poorly managing our society. This bill is creating a tremendous disaster for the weak and the people who need support in our communities.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this bill on report stage, Bill C-32, an act to amend the Canada Assistance Plan and the Motion No. 1 to delete clause 1.

Bill C-32 was given first reading on September 18, 1991. The bill will effectively extend the limit on the 5 per cent increases in federal contributions to British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario until 1994-95. These provinces are not receiving equalization payments.

This will prolong the agony even more by not understanding the call of the National Council on Welfare which says this must not happen. An advisory body of 21 members composed of present and past welfare recipients, social workers, lawyers, professors, people from all walks of life give a perspective and advice as a body to the minister of health. Yet, the minister of health of this government has turned deaf.

When the Supreme Court of Canada made its decision on August 16, 1991 saying that the federal government has a right to withhold its contribution it did not say that it should do it. The court only conferred the onus of that responsibility on the federal government. When that decision was announced the executive director of the Canadian Council on Social Development, Mr. Patrick Johnston, said: "The decision of the Supreme Court paves the way for the federal government to further limit