

*Borrowing Authority Act***POINT OF ORDER**

## ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

**Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During Question Period the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) said: "That is gutter politics", in response to a question which I asked. I find that unparliamentary and I believe that you did too, Mr. Speaker, because you asked the Minister to desist from completing his answer. I ask you to review the matter and, in effect, ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw the unparliamentary language which was used in the House.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, whether they are unparliamentary or not, I will be very happy to withdraw the words.

## SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

**Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, with all respect, I would seek clarification of the situation when a Member stands for a supplementary question and yells "supplementary", and the Speaker is not inclined to give him a supplementary question at that time, and the Member sits down. Are we now changing the rules such that if the Speaker looks at a Member when he is sitting, encouraging him to stand up, the Member should then stand? Are you going to call the shots?

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) claimed a supplementary question. At that time I had already begun to recognize the Member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan). As it seemed to me appropriate, I looked to see if the Hon. Member for Athabasca was rising again. The Hon. Member for Athabasca chose not to rise again. Therefore, I recognized another Member. The Hon. Member for Athabasca knows that Members rise continually seeking the eye of the Chair if they wish the Chair to recognize them for a question.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1986-87**

## MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mrs. McDougall that Bill C-99, an Act to provide borrowing authority, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, just before the lunch break I was pointing out that there was a

certain consistency evident with regard to what the Conservative Party was like when it was in Opposition and what it is now like in Government. The recent comment of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) is consistent with what I was talking about. I was expecting that at any minute he would be joined by other back-benchers who would charge the Speaker's chair in anger over something which was, in fact, done quite properly.

There is a necessity for the Government to establish for itself some consistency in the way in which it approaches public policy. It cannot have it every which way. The Government cannot on one day be for the concept of universality, and on the next day argue against it. The Government cannot, through the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), claim that universality is a sacred trust and then, in its very next Budget, say that universal access is really what it is talking about. I think it is fair to say that those of us who have followed that debate are able to distinguish quite clearly between universality as it has been practised in Canada, and something called "universal access", which may or may not make available to those who need it the kind of help they need.

This Bill ought not to be passed now, Mr. Speaker. It is based on information contained in the budget papers which is clearly faulty. They contain references to interest rates and oil prices which are clearly not sustainable in today's society. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme):

That this Bill be not now read a second time but be read a second time this day six months hence.

**Mr. Speaker:** The debate will now be on the amendment, it being in order.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in my place in support of the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) who was his normal articulate self for the minute or so that he took to complete his debate.

There is a very good reason why Bill C-99 ought to be given a six-month hoist. As a matter of fact, inasmuch as the Bill is symbolic of the Government's financial plan, more than the six-month hoist, it ought to be given the boot.

The Government of Canada today has a fiscal plan which represents the vision of the Party in power. The other day, with a great deal of exasperation and disbelief, we heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) say, while appearing before some of his friends in Montreal: "I have a vision". He went on to talk about that vision. He assured us that if we would be patient until the year 2020 or 2030, he would get around to delivering on that vision. I do not think the Government's vision will not be realized until the year 2030. I think the vision is much more short-sighted. It is a very clear vision which they understand and have mapped out. However, they are not prepared to talk about it in plain language with the people of Canada.

This reminds me a little of the kind of frenzied paranoia of Howard Hughes locked away in the penthouse of the hotel he bought in Las Vegas, Nevada. He was shut away from the real