

*Adjournment Motion*

placed a greater burden on the people of Saskatchewan in the form of a deficit that is larger than had been accumulated in that province in the previous 55 years. That is what we can expect from a Progressive Conservative administration. It is the same kind of deficit financing that we can expect from the present Government.

If we are to consider the Liberal administration and a possible Conservative administration, we should also consider a New Democratic Party administration as well. There was a New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan for 30 out of the last 40 years. In that time it did not accumulate any deficit. If there was a deficit in one year, it was paid off in the next year, so that there was no accumulated deficit in those 30 years. That Government produced the best social service programs in the country and was able to pay for them as a result of its planning. It never planned any social services until it was ready and willing to pay for them. As a result of this careful administration in planning its expenditures, it provided Saskatchewan with 30 years of a government and social structure that was the best in Canada, probably the best in North America and one of the best in the world. This was accomplished in Saskatchewan without creating a deficit, and it represents the kind of planning that is necessary to make expenditures that are worthwhile and meaningful for the people of Canada.

When considering the Government's request for further funding, we should look no further than its record. In a matter of 16 short years the Government has put us in a position where it will probably take future governments another 15 years to get out of it. We should be doing that kind of planning now and not increasing our deficit at this time.

• (1600)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Human Rights—Appeal in sexual harassment case. (b) Funding of appeal; the Hon. Member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby)—The Senate—Appointment of eight new Senators. (b) Request that Prime Minister delay making further appointments; the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker)—Mines and Mining—Western Canadian coal production. (b) Importation of United States coal.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1984-85

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacLaren that Bill C-21, an Act to provide borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs; and the amendment of Mr. Darling (p. 2292); and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Deans (p. 2299).

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to join my colleagues in denunciation of the Government which introduced closure on this Bill. This is a most blatant Bill. This is a record breaking borrowing Bill. It is larger than any other borrowing Bill brought before the Parliament of Canada. It stands in the amount of \$29.55 billion. I just heard the Hon. Member for Lac St. Jean (Mr. Gimaiel), in a most fallacious argument, ask why we have speeches in opposition to this borrowing Bill at all because the same responses and the same comments are being made. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask Members opposite, is there no man or woman of conscience and integrity on that side of the House? I suggest to you that any open-minded government would be coming before this House and giving an explanation as to why it needs the dollars the Government proposes to spend.

This same borrowing Bill includes a \$4 billion contingency fund. The Hon. Member for Lac St. Jean says, "Why, we are only borrowing from Canadians. It does not become a real debt. It is not part of our deficit. It might not have to be paid off. The money is being borrowed from Canadians". I suggest that when a Government comes before this House and borrows more money than do all Canadians all across this land save in one year, then it is forcing interest rates up and driving up inflation. What is bound to follow is the kind of action this Government is now taking.

However, I want to make a comment in support of the amendment introduced by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling), the only kind of comment that is an appropriate response to the borrowing Bill now introduced. The issue is clear and so is that amendment. The Government has come to Parliament in search of borrowing authority in the amount of \$29.55 billion. This amount is not only the largest borrowing authority request in Canadian history, it goes beyond the needs of the present Government. My colleague has responded that we should throw the matter back. Let us not give this Bill second reading. Let us reconsider the Bill in a credible and conscientious manner. His response is made on the basis of principle. I wonder on what basis the Government has introduced this Bill.

Observers of the Thirty-second Parliament will wonder if borrowing Bills represent the sum total of this Government's program. We have had eight similar borrowing Bills in lesser amounts since the 1980 election. The slippery slopes start early. After February 1980, within three months of that date,