

*Borrowing Authority Act*

**Mr. Hudon:** Mr. Speaker, I am not overly concerned about polls. They may brag and feel complacent because the results show 26 per cent against 27 per cent for the Conservatives, but you know very well that in Quebec the New Democratic Party Members always enjoy renewed popularity between elections, but the people will not vote for you.

**An Hon. Member:** Renewed popularity is all they ever get.

**Mr. Hudon:** Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it shows the boldness of Mr. Wilson. If we were the kind of people who govern according to the surveys, we would only have proposed so-called popular measures, as our opponents used to do. They gave, they indexed, they gave, they indexed and then they were ditched. What do people want in Canada, in Quebec? They want people who honour their commitments. You are asking me if I support the 1 per cent? I am the one answering. You are asking me if I support the 1 per cent, the 3 per cent? Yes, Mr. Speaker, having been one of the 22 members who voted for the Budget. You were not even here to vote, you were not even here to vote against it, you of the New Democratic Party. You were out eating. I was here to vote for the Budget, and I support that. What I stand for, Mr. Speaker, also in personal life because it is the same thing, I stand for honouring my debts, tightening my belt in some areas in order to pay my debts, whether they are 1 per cent or 3 per cent.

Secondly, you say we are giving to the rich. We introduced a minimum income tax, Mr. Speaker, so everyone must pay. But I can tell you that the rich did not build this country, investors did. And the braggers, we had plenty of those who wanted to solve other problems, who came here and solved everything. But it took investors in the Province of Quebec to put people to work, to put money up front and to take risks. They are the one I will encourage, Mr. Speaker, because they will be creating jobs. It is not I who will be creating the jobs.

[English]

**Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, first let me say that in 14 years I have never felt that my rights as a Member were infringed upon before today.

**Mr. Valcourt:** Tell the truth. Where were you?

**Mr. Rompkey:** The truth is this, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not you operate on technicalities is up to you, Mr. Speaker, but there is an intent behind the rules. That intent involves courtesy and civility. In my opinion, neither courtesy nor civility were used today. In the Budget debate and in the Throne Speech debate my experience has been that individual Members of Parliament are given latitude to speak not only on the content of the Budget or the Throne Speech but about their own ridings. It is a time when the individual Member of Parliament has his day to speak on behalf of the people who sent him here. I feel that latitude was abrogated today in a shameful way.

Whatever you say about the technicalities—and you may be right that people were not here a few minutes after two o'clock, and you may be right in your interpretation of the new rules which, I thought, gave more power, more authority and more place to individual Members of Parliament—the mood, the intent or the motive behind those rules was not heeded today, in my opinion. I feel that on this major issue I have been affronted as a Member of Parliament for the first time. I resent that and I want it on the record.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rompkey:** I was here to speak shortly after two o'clock. I wanted to make a speech on a major Government initiative but I was unable to do so because of what I think is a light-hearted and frivolous attitude toward this place in which we stand. I do not condone that. I condemn it and I resent it.

Now I want to make some comments about the Budget that was just passed.

**Mrs. Maily:** This is the borrowing authority.

**Mr. Rompkey:** I want to speak on the borrowing authority Bill because I did not get a chance to make those comments about the Budget.

**Mrs. Maily:** You will make the same speech.

**Mr. Rompkey:** In this Budget, again, the Atlantic area has been cut adrift by a Government which is philosophically bent upon letting the private sector take its own initiatives. If you think I am biased, Mr. Speaker, I want to read some comments made by the Premier of Newfoundland who is of the same persuasion as the Government opposite. Premier Peckford, at a news conference put the case as well as I can put it, but what he said comes from a less biased person than myself. He said:

—over-all, it looks like Newfoundland is going to be part of a national economic recovery which is going to make recovery here more difficult.

—what the federal Government is actually doing is transferring its deficit from the federal level to the provincial levels and the end result will be that the over-all national debt, considering the situation in each province, won't change all that much.

● (1520)

He went on to say that the province is still trying to assess exactly where Newfoundland stands but that at present it looks as if the only people to benefit really from the Budget are the low-income earners. While this is a positive thing, over-all Newfoundlanders are going to have less disposable income than before. In the *Evening Telegram* of February 28, 1986, he went on to say that the federal Budget will provide about \$8 million for low-income families but that this year about \$6.5 million will go out of the province as a result of higher taxes and that next year that figure will escalate to about \$13.5 million.

I want to emphasize again that these are not my figures or comments. I adhere to them and support them and this is what I want to say, but these are the comments of the Premier of