

I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister's peace initiative is one which has enjoyed the non-partisan support of the House. It is a peace initiative endorsed not only by Members on this side of the House unanimously but one which has been endorsed by Members of the NDP and endorsed quite strongly by the Hon. Member's own Leader, the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney). It is an initiative which has received the very strongest of all possible support from the former Prime Minister and former Leader of the Opposition, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), who has said repeatedly these last few months that the initiative is one that he believes has been undertaken by the Prime Minister in the most sincere way possible, that it is an initiative of Canada and of all Canadians and is one which he says deserves the support of all Canadians. I was pleased to hear the new Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Central Nova, echo in the House and elsewhere in Canada those sentiments. My comment, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I must—

**Mr. Tobin:** My question, Mr. Speaker, is—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The Hon. Member has made a comment. Again, I appeal to all Hon. Members in the House to make their questions or comments brief and to the point. The Hon. Member is going a little bit overboard in this case. Perhaps we should allow the Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) to respond, and if there is time, we will then return to the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin).

**Mr. Stewart:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be very brief. Of all people, I do not think that the Hon. Member across the way should talk about a fishing expedition when he knows what has happened to the fishing industry in his province, when he knows how many unemployed there are in his province and when he knows that the only relief for those unemployed is the porkbarreling under the Local Employment Initiatives Program and a few other programs which have been implemented there for re-election purposes.

As far as the Prime Minister's peace initiative is concerned, I did not say one word against that and never would. I applaud the peace initiative taken by the Prime Minister. That has nothing to do with 187 days of travel. That peace initiative consisted of a few good days well spent, and we still applaud it. I would like to say one thing to my hon. friend. If that initiative was so successful, why did the Prime Minister tender his resignation?

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, I was about to question the Hon. Member's integrity regarding this debate, but nothing I could say could more vividly exemplify his narrow partisanship than the kind of deficient answer he has given. I knew that the vision was narrow but I did not know that it could be focused on a pinpoint. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me this chance to comment on that spurious attack on a great peace initiative.

### *Borrowing Authority Act*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** I recognize the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher) on debate. Speeches are now to be 10 minutes long.

**Mr. Douglas Fisher (Mississauga North):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today. Before I begin, I wish to say that my father, Clancy Fisher, is currently a guest of the Canadian people and is enjoying a little stay at the University Hospital in London. I cannot think of very many better ways to see the Government spend its money than by making him comfortable in that marvellous institution. If we are going to talk about government spending today, I would like to dedicate my remarks to that great Canadian, my father, and wish him all the best on behalf of all of us.

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

**Mr. Fisher:** I see that it is a non-partisan sentiment. I know that my father is watching today and that he will thank the Tory and NDP Members for the kind words they have just passed along.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are debating a borrowing authority Bill. We are talking about government spending, and that takes us right to the heart of the political viewpoints and philosophies of each of the Parties in the Chamber. I think that in this pre-election period, it is important for us to note the general direction in which the given Parties would take the country. We do not have to turn to campaign rhetoric, to third-Party endorsements, or to some special economic analysis. We may turn right to the statements made by the individuals themselves in the Chamber. That is where we see how each Party would guide Canada if elected in the next general election. That is an analysis that I would like to undertake in the next few minutes.

Based upon its track record, I think it is clear that the Liberal Party believes in a partnership with the Canadian people. Members of the Liberal Party believe in a balance between what is needed and what is affordable. We believe that we should stimulate the economy in tough times, we should reach out to people who are in the greatest need, and we should use the country's resources as a blessing to cushion us when the rest of the world is having difficulty. That is the position taken by the Liberal Party.

The position taken by the Conservative Party is somewhat different. That position was revealed clearly by the remarks made by the last speaker. As we analyse those remarks, I think we will notice that Conservative Members love to wallow around in their love of money. It has gone beyond a desire for frugality and has become an obsession with Members on the other side. They love to pick out areas in which they think the Government can cut back and then to trumpet these from coast to coast. Again, we are in an analytical mood today. Let us note that Members of the Conservative Party cannot wait to hack and tear at the basic fibre of this marvellous country.

Let us look at what the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) said as quoted in *The Toronto Star* of February 21, 1984: