

*Borrowing Authority*

in the world today, if over the preceding years they have taxed themselves to death, have borrowed until they are unable to borrow any more, then they are easy victims and do not have the capability to fight back. That is precisely what is happening in Canada today. We are now paying for the mistakes and the faults of Government going back to 1968, and even before that. Canada is an easy victim of the recession because of past Liberal policies.

I would strongly suggest that the institution of Parliament and all of its Members, not just those on this side but also a good number of those on the other side, have some real doubts about the request the Government has put forward to us today for some \$19 billion of borrowing authority. Many Parliamentarians here are scared to say no, because they do not know what would happen if Parliament said no and there was no more money to be made available to the Government, or the amount of money was severely reduced. But if this Parliament does not say no, there is no stopping these fellows on the other side. There is no stopping the Government. We have seen what has happened in the past, and it is the same old treadmill. They will continue in their reckless and abandoned way.

If Parliament says no, then we will force the Government to put its house in order. We know it will be difficult to do that and we know that there will be political repercussions, but some day we are going to be faced with that and it might as well be now as some time in the future when the problem will be even worse.

Just look at what has been happening of late in the Province of Quebec, the fiscal calamity of that Government—that is a familiar term; I heard it used by somebody on the other side some time ago, before he was a member of the Privy Council. However, the situation in which the Government of Quebec has got itself into is proportionately worse than that of the federal Government of Canada. Unlike the federal Government of Canada, the Government of Quebec cannot print money. It does not have the same recourse to the printing press as the federal Government has. So it has been forced into the crunch, forced to take actions that undoubtedly it wishes it did not have to take. And look at the result. There is almost rioting in the streets.

I suggest the same situation is going to catch up with us federally unless we take action now to anticipate those things to come.

I wonder if I might call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

[*English*]

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. When the House rose at one o'clock, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) had three minutes remaining in the 20 minutes allotted to him.

**Mr. Nickerson:** Mr. Speaker, in the three minutes that remain to me, I will briefly put an end to what I was saying before lunch. I was describing the treadmill upon which we have got ourselves, the treadmill of unemployment, deficits, borrowing, more unemployment and yet more deficits. I was suggesting that Parliament has it within its power now to put a stop to that. I do not suggest it would be easy to do that. I do not suggest there would not be a period of difficulty, but I can assure the House that people would readjust and that Canada would come out of this period of readjustment lean, strong and fit and without the accumulation of Liberal baggage which has grown up over many years.

Members of Parliament now have it within their power to put a stop to this. We can vote no to this Bill. We can put an end to the Liberal financial ineptitude and stupidity and we can put Canada back in shape. It has to be done some time, and I suggest we do it now.

**Mr. Keeper:** Mr. Speaker, my question for the Hon. Member has to do with comments he made earlier today. He indicated that the reason we have a deficit in this nation is that the NDP have been advocating the expenditure of public moneys and the Liberals have been following our advice.

I want to point out that the Hon. Member has at least conceded the fact that the NDP is an effective Party in this House and that we can affect public policy. I want to point out the kind of things that we have fought for in this House. We have fought for Unemployment Insurance so that people do not suffer in times of economic depression such as we have now. We have fought for pensions for old people in this country so that they can lead a decent life in their old age. We have fought for Family Allowances, a fight in which the Tory Party has not joined hands, the six and five debate. We also fought for the development of medicare. Which of those items—Unemployment Insurance, pensions, Family Allowances medicare—does the Hon. Member decry the NDP for having fought for in this House?

**Mr. Nickerson:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly do agree with the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper) that the New Democratic Party, in conjunction with the Liberal Party, has been effective. It has certainly been effective in putting Canada on the brink of bankruptcy.

Where do we start cutting down the costs of Government? The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-St. James is quite right in pointing out that some of the social programs we have in this country are very expensive. If you examine the budget, you find that we spend much more on these items, which are really