

For example at the end of World War II we had the highest national debt in history and subsequently the greatest prosperity. But we owed it to ourselves. The point that I am making here is that the \$7 billion which was borrowed abroad by the former minister of finance, and the \$7 billion borrowing which is proposed through this bill by the current Minister of Finance, constitute a very dangerous step because it means that massive amounts of money will be flowing out of the country to service that debt.

At the same time the argument is being used all the time that Canada's interest rate must be higher than that of the United States so that investment capital will flow into Canada. That theory has not worked either because if one looks at the figures of the last year, he will find that, despite our high interest rates, more money in terms of investments has gone out of the country than has come into it. I suggest that the \$7 billion which the former government borrowed and the \$7 billion which this government proposes to borrow could have been used to purchase the majority of the petroleum industry in this country for Canadians. If one is ideologically opposed to have that industry owned by the state, it could at least have been purchased through the use of that money from foreigners and owned by Canadian entrepreneurs.

I serve this as a particular warning to the Minister of Finance, and plead that he does not rush out to the money markets of the United States to borrow this \$7 billion even though this bill would authorize him to do so.

We in this party would feel much better if this money were used to buy back our country, to stimulate development or, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) suggested, for R and D to create jobs. If that were the case, my party could support it with some, if not a great deal, of enthusiasm and despite the concerns which I have expressed. But at the moment with all the information before us tonight, which is meagre at best, we are not really enchanted with the bill.

I hope that when the minister does get around to telling us how he intends to use this money, it will be used in a way that this party can approve of because, regardless of the fact that we are sometimes critical, we too want this country to go ahead, we too want to create full employment, we too want to see our country owned by Canadians, and we too want to see this government succeed in improving our nation. With that, I will conclude my remarks and prepare the way for someone else who might have at least 20 minutes to speak, and I hope that it is the minister.

● (2140)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Some time this evening the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae), seconded by the hon. member for Timmins-Chapleau (Mr. Chenier), moved a reasoned amendment while the Acting Speaker was in the chair. The latter did not make a decision but suggested that a decision should be made tomorrow. I have therefore arranged to be here early, before the minister takes the floor, so that a decision can be made before we conclude the debate on second reading of this bill.

Borrowing Authority

The motion of the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan reads as follows:

That this bill be not now read a second time but be stood until the Minister of Finance agrees to appear before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs at the pleasure of that committee and preceding the appearance of the Governor of the Bank of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard) on a point of order.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that you are ready to make a decision without hearing the arguments on the admissibility of the amendment?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I was not there yet. I should say that even if the Acting Speaker who was then in the chair suggested that he had some reservations, he did not mention what they were. As for myself, I had the opportunity to consider the precedents and I want to advise hon. members that on four points at least I can hardly accept the amendment now under consideration. I could refer hon. members to the various sources of reference, but first I will merely indicate that, in my opinion, the amendment now under consideration is inconsistent with different principles which are the basis of reasoned amendments and the first principle which should identify such an amendment is that it should be declaratory and adverse to the bill.

[*English*]

Hon. members are referred to two different citations, Erskine May's nineteenth edition, and Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fifth edition. The first condition that has to be attached to a reasoned amendment is that it may be declaratory of some principle of the bill or adverse to the bill. That is found at page 499 of Erskine May and citation 744 of Beauchesne. On that ground alone the amendment could be rejected.

There is another reference that suggests a reasoned amendment should not set a condition for second reading of a bill. At page 500 of Erskine May's nineteenth edition paragraph (2) reads as follows:

The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee (k); nor is it permissible to propose merely the addition of words to the question, that the bill be now read a second time, as such words must, by implication, attach conditions to the second reading.

Hon. members will find similar citations in Beauchesne who referred to more recent times, as reported in Canadian *Journals*. At page 226 of the fifth edition of Beauchesne, citation 745(3) reads as follows:

It is not permissible to propose merely the addition of words to the question, 'That the bill be now read a second time', as such words must, by implication, attach conditions to the second reading.