

say, "Shame, shame on the Government which would cause that to happen".

At the present time the Minister of Transport is proposing sweeping changes to the Crowsnest Agreement without even bringing them before the House for its consideration. Literally billions of dollars would be granted to the railway system, besides the changes to the Crowsnest Agreement, which could literally destroy the grain markets of the Canadian economy. The Government has made such proposals without debate of any kind in the House.

The Premier of the Province of British Columbia, on a tour of my Province, came into my area and said what a great venture it would be and how it should be carried out. I received a resolution from the municipal councils in my riding endorsing the proposed provisions in the Crowsnest Agreement. However, we have not even had the opportunity to see nor to debate those very basic changes the Government is proposing, which could create some very serious economic problems across Canada.

Those are the kinds of problems the Government is creating. I say that it is no wonder we have such a large deficit. The Government should be sincere about doing something about the deficit instead of attacking Family Allowance benefits, the cheques of senior citizens, and the pensions of public servants. It should devise a program so that there is equity in these projects for every dollar allocated to the railway system. Then, as it started to develop, the money could be paid back. We are certainly in full agreement that the transportation system must be upgraded across Canada. However, we do not agree that money should be given, for instance, to CP Rail, which has done nothing but drag its feet and take money from the Government over the years, exploiting it and using it in other areas without carrying out its commitments. It is a shame that the Government would make those kinds of changes with regard to pensions, the indexing of Family Allowances and so on.

I would like to refer to the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola) who is responsible for the status of women. Her riding is Nickel Belt. I think it is appropriate to let the people hear what she has done. An editorial letter was captioned: "Sweeping statements are unfair to thousands of Canadian women." This was printed in the Sudbury *Star* of January 17, 1983. It reads:

● (1650)

I strongly object to your insinuation that unemployed, childless women contribute nothing to Canadian society.

I am a childless unemployed Canadian woman. My husband and I remain childless because we cannot have children of our own and because we feel we cannot personally accept adoption or unnatural conception. I am unemployed because, after 10 years of teaching elementary school, my husband was transferred to Sudbury. I oppose a viewpoint that brands me as a non-contributor in my own country. I further feel that your views on contribution to society are narrow and without thought.

That is another indication of this Government's attitude toward the Canadian people and how this country will be governed. There is no industrial strategy that will put people

Time Allocation

back to work. The deficit that we face, combined with this closure motion, is an insult to all Canadians, especially Members of Parliament who have not had an opportunity to express their views as to how this deficit may be brought under control or put to better use in order to create employment and give some future to the many unemployed who look to this Government for some direction.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to move ahead in our debate on this Bill. It is time to finish this stage of our discussion, get this Bill into committee, back from committee and passed so that the Government can proceed with the other elements in its program. This is my argument because I believe we have had plenty of time for debate on this topic. Second, we know, and every practical-thinking Canadian knows, that the money is needed. Third, we know and have demonstrated, as did the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Cosgrove) today, that there are efficient ways to borrow money that will save Canadians millions and millions of dollars, and the smooth passage of this Bill will help us with that efficiency.

Let us look at some of the fascinating statistics about our debate so far. We see that until this time Parliament has dedicated five full debating days to this Bill, which I am told represents some 15 hours and 41 minutes of discussion. During that time we have heard from 46 comrades in arms from the Conservative Party, 15 of our colleagues in the new Democratic Party, and ten Members of the Government, up until this morning.

Far more important than all of that, we have had a lot of debate on the basic instruments which led up to this Bill, the financial instruments that gave us some idea of the Government's sense of direction.

For example, we had ample discussion on the Minister's statement of last October. At that time he laid out the Government's program and its borrowing requirements up to the end of this current fiscal year. As we look at this borrowing authority Bill, we see clearly from the statement last October where the money will go. That is a very important point because the Opposition has regularly clouded that fact in its discussion. There is plenty of information available from the November, 1981 budget, the June budget and the October statement. There is plenty of information to indicate the direction of the Government's programs over the next few months.

Second, we had from the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) a detailed set of Estimates for the fiscal year 1983-84. Equally, we have had, and every Member of this House knows it, a pledge from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) to produce a budget as quickly as he can. However, he said that we must clear the decks before he bring in another budget. He made it a condition that we must clear away the Income Tax Act, straighten out the borrowing authority, and clear up the six and five legislation.

We have done much of that. The Minister views it as irresponsible, and he said this in the House and outside, for us