

Borrowing Authority

wanted to explain that point to the House and to the people of Canada.

• (1220)

Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in the debate this morning. However, the remarks made by the last two speakers from the Official Opposition have prompted me to rise and offer my reflections on what they said and what has been said on this subject in the House to date. I do not recall their constituencies but the two Members who participated and motivated me to speak this morning are Mr. Nowlan from Annapolis Valley—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is not the usual practice in the House to refer to Hon. Members by their surnames.

Mr. Kelly: I realize that, Mr. Speaker. I am mentioning their surnames so that I may get the correct constituency from you and use it in my remarks. The second Member who spoke and attracted my attention this morning is the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Scott).

I believe that the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) is approaching this debate from the proper perspective when he says that we should look at it in its human dimension. I think he is quite right. While we are concerned with money in this debate, we are in the final analysis really talking about people, and I was delighted to hear him approach this debate from that perspective.

Following those remarks, the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Wentworth rose to make a speech. In his remarks he suggested that, if one were to visit his riding or any riding in Canada to talk to the average Canadians in restaurants, senior citizen homes or anywhere else and ask them, on the basis of this human perspective, how they felt about the Government spending \$19 billion, their reaction would be one of almost total outrage. I would suggest that the first speaker had the right attitude but that the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Wentworth asked the wrong question based on that attitude.

I believe that if we want to get a human perspective on this issue, people should not be asked whether they would like to spend that amount of money. I think the answer to that question would obviously be no, people would not like to have to spend \$19 billion, \$19,000 or \$1,900. Nobody likes to have to spend money. I suggest that the question the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Wentworth should have asked in this hypothetical situation is "do you like to receive services." He could have asked the senior citizen if he wants his pension and to live comfortably in the senior citizen building. He could have asked the person who is sick if he wants to receive medicare. He could have asked those who are unemployed if they want to receive Unemployment Insurance benefits or welfare. He could have asked the students if they want to continue to enjoy the university and college courses they are taking now and the ones they will take in the future. He should have asked the businessmen if they want to continue to have their business grants and tax write-offs. Those on the right wing of the spectrum could have been asked if they want the defence forces built up and those on the left wing could have been

asked if they want their social services maintained and enriched.

I submit that those questions reflect the human perspective of the issue. Those are the questions that the Member for Hamilton-Wentworth should have been asking the average Canadian in restaurants, senior citizen homes and factories. If they were asked about receiving \$19 billion in terms of those questions, instead of asking them if they want to spend the money, I think their response would have been yes, they want those services.

The Official Opposition does not want us to spend \$19 billion; obviously, those Members want us to spend less. However, I believe that none of them has suggested how much less they would spend. If they are interested in making a noticeable dent in this borrowing Bill, they would want to spend \$2 billion to \$5 billion less. If they find out borrowing Bill morally, intellectually and economically offensive and believe less should be spent, where would they cut costs? If they wanted to save up to \$5 billion, where would they cut spending?

Some Members opposite, such as the Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald), enjoy rising to criticize Government spending. When they are asked where they would make these spending cuts, they invariably say we should cut advertising expenditures because that is a waste of money. I tend to agree that advertising may be a waste of money, but its reduction does not constitute a very significant cut in the budget. If they are really concerned about cutting money, it is necessary to cut billions of dollars from the budget. When they move beyond the small amounts in Government advertising and other areas, where will the large expenditures be reduced?

We suggested that these reductions could be made by changing the character of the post office, which costs taxpayers \$500 million a year. We thought we could save the taxpayers that money but the Opposition's response was no. We said that we could save money by reducing the increase in civil servants' salaries. The Opposition opposed that. We tried to save hundreds of millions of dollars by restructuring and realigning the railway system, but the Opposition vehemently opposed that.

I would listen more attentively to their arguments in this debate if they would tell me with some insight and honesty—the same honesty they asked of us—where they would make their spending cuts. I am afraid to wait for those answers for it would be like waiting for Godot, because they would never come. That is the unfortunate character of this debate. The Opposition can criticize us while posing no alternatives. They have nothing substantial or of real value to suggest.

I agree with Members opposite that there should be morality in the debates of the House. There should be honesty in arguments presented to the House that are designed to influence public opinion. I do not believe that that morality and honesty is present in the arguments made by the Opposition, certainly not from what I have heard today. If the Opposition is honest and moral in its belief that we should not spend \$19