# Borrowing Authority Act

Madam Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. Therefore, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At 6.10 p.m. the House took recess.

• (2000)

[English]

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## **BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development has been meeting all day to hear witnesses and to study clause by clause Bill C-26, a bill of great importance to the Fort Nelson Indian Band of British Columbia. At 6.30 this evening the work of that committee on that bill was completed. At this time I would ask the unanimous consent of the House to revert to "Presenting Reports of Standing and Special Committees" so that the report could be tabled this evening.

### [Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. Hon. members have heard the request made by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Penner). Is it the pleasure of the House to agree to the request?

[English]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

#### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

## INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

First report of Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Penner.

[Editor's Note: For text of above report see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

#### **BORROWING AUTHORITY ACT, 1980-81**

SUPPLEMENTARY BORROWING AUTHORITY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Bussières (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-30, to

provide supplementary borrowing authority for the fiscal year 1980-81, be read the third time and do pass.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Ouestion.

Mr. Mazankowski: I understand the question will be put later. However, I appreciate the enthusiasm of hon. members across the way.

I want to begin by first associating myself with the comments made by members on this side of the House, particularly the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). I wish to reiterate the very deep and genuine concern that we on this side have regarding the passage of this bill, which provides spending or borrowing authority of some \$12 billion, without having been given some details as to the future plans of the government. As my colleague for Mississauga South indicated, we are giving the government carte blanche authority without having any definitive program outlined in terms of what the spending program will be, and with the lack of a budget, and so on.

I found it rather amusing when the spokesman for the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae), said that the people of Canada had been cheated by the introduction of this bill. I find that rather strange coming from that corner of the House. I think it is fair to say that if anyone has been cheated, the people of Canada have been cheated by the activities of the NDP opposition—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: —when not too long ago they exercised their political opportunistic tricks to defeat a government which was attempting to put the economic house of this country in order and to establish some sanity and stability in terms of where we are going in so far as reducing the deficit, and putting into place some discipline in the spending and taxation in connection with the fiscal and monetary policies of this country. This is the typical hypocritical doubletalk we hear from that side of the House. It has become a very significant trademark for that group of people. I must say that particular caucus is the champion of doubletalk and hypocrisy.

We are talking about a lot of money here. When we talk about a bill like this in the House of Commons, we have a tendency to overlook the significance of a million or a billion dollars. It is always very difficult to try to put a billion dollars or a billion of anything into its proper perspective. About a year ago I came across a little definition of a billion which I thought was rather significant. I would like to place it on the record because it does put into perspective the magnitude of a billion. The little definition goes like this.

It is entitled "What is a billion?". A billion seconds ago, the first atomic bomb had not yet been exploded. A billion minutes ago, Christ was still on this earth. A billion hours ago, men were still living in caves, yet more than a billion dollars ago, in terms of federal government spending that was one week ago. I think that brings into focus the magnitude of a billion. If you