

Immigration Committee where it could have been studied and where groups and communities which were affected could have made the presentations which are necessary.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I listened with some amazement to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Churchill. I really thought there was no one in this House who was opposed to these particular amendments. Now I find that there is someone who wants to drag his feet and delay the legislation, which would impact adversely on 175,000 Canadians who are most in need of this particular legislation.

The Hon. Member's colleague, the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt, understands what these particular amendments are all about. He is well aware that this legislation has not met with any criticism or complaint from the people who are affected by these particular amendments. If the Hon. Member for Churchill thinks that what we really need to do is drop the variable entry requirement, do away with the minimum 10 week period for people in the fishing community, for instance, and if the Hon. Member thinks that that is the way in which the groups he seems to be speaking for want to go, then he should rise in his place and have the courtesy to say so.

I can tell the Hon. Member that in all of the representations I have heard on the variable entry requirement, I have heard no suggestion to drop that 10 week period. To the contrary. That is why we are putting this legislation through. I have talked to Hon. Members on the government side and Hon. Members from the Opposition Parties, who have urged that this legislation go through as quickly as possible. I would hope that the Hon. Member would see the reason for this and would want to give it his support as well.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister, for whatever reason, has misunderstood my question. I am not against the variable entrance requirement. I have spoken in favour of it in this House before. What I asked is why we are dealing with this legislation so quickly? Why are we refusing to deal with it in a proper legislative manner? Why was this not introduced a month ago? We are not doing anything new. If the deputy whip of the Conservative Party would listen for a while, instead of yapping, maybe she would learn something. The point is that there was time. This Bill could have been introduced one month earlier. It could have gone before committee and the people who are concerned, as well as those who happen to be in favour of the legislation, could have had input. Our Party, through our critic, has agreed that we will pass this legislation because we recognize it will benefit so many Canadians. We have no problem with that.

Mrs. Mailly: Sit down, then.

Mr. Murphy: I am a little tired of the deputy whip of the Conservative Party yapping away. If she wants to speak, she does have the ability to rise in her place and speak.

The point is that we have a parliamentary reform committee which exists at this present time and which is discussing how we can strengthen and legitimize the role of the parliamentary committees. One of the main purposes of committees is to

Borrowing Authority Act

study legislation, to look at it to see how it affects Canadians. I have a concern with the legislation and with how we deal with the economic regions. My riding is grouped with other parts of Canada which have a lower unemployment rate. As a result of that, the variable rate does not benefit parts of my riding according to the actual unemployment there. I am concerned about that. Because of the process we are going through, we do not have a chance to examine that in detail. I wish the Minister, just as I wished with Liberal Ministers, had introduced this legislation early enough that we could study it in committee and give it the attention any piece of legislation deserves.

● (1230)

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

* * *

BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1985-86 (NO. 2)

MEASURE TO ENACT

Hon. Flora MacDonald (for the Minister of State (Finance)) moved that Bill C-51, an Act to provide borrowing authority be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Miss Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that there is no Minister in the House prepared to speak on the introduction of the Bill. If indeed that is the case—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson).

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance): I apologize, Mr. Speaker. Things happen so quickly around here, I had not realized that we had completed the previous piece of legislation. However, I do want to speak on the introduction of Bill C-51, requesting parliamentary authority for the borrowing of \$18.2 billion.

While I am very pleased to stand before the House today, I cannot say that I am doing so with great enthusiasm in asking this House for approval of these expenditures because it is very clear we are dealing with a legacy of the previous Government. It is a legacy which continues to impose a very severe burden on the people of Canada. In the eight months or so since we have been in office, we have indicated a resolute desire to deal with that legacy by putting in place, both in the November economic statement as well as the Budget last week, a series of