

does not lend them greater strength and their substance rests on principles, on their logic and not on a mere repetition or summing up. Because something is repeated 20 times over does not add to its logic. It may sink in one's mind better, but that is a matter of memory and not intelligence, and passing judgment depends on intelligence and not memory. Remembering things depends on memory, but judging them depends on reason. So, it is pointless to repeat the same thing for 20, 25 or 26 hours. The matter at hand is one of argument and demonstration that one is right; that has already been done over a certain length of time, or a number of hours; arguments have been made and proved and, for our part, we feel the point has been made adequately. Why are they opposing it? As for us, we took a few minutes to make our point on second reading, and we are ready to keep discussing this particular bill in committee. As I said, Mr. Speaker, all members have the opportunity to ask questions on every aspect of government spending during consideration of the estimates in committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the government House leader is always reluctant to set a time limit on debate. He would rather reach a common agreement, but he has to assume his responsibilities and expedite the business of the House and the government's legislative program in an orderly fashion. That is why we have to discuss this motion.

● (1620)

[English]

**Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussières), who implied that the government was continually faced with delays which they for some reason or other could no longer tolerate. It should be apparent to all hon. members and particularly to the deputy government whip who just waved to me that that is not the case.

The history of this session of Parliament has been that when the Government of Canada has seen fit to bring forward legislation which advances the interests of the country, the opposition parties have in fact co-operated with the government House leader to ensure that the legislation goes through. Although there are many such instances, two come to mind. One is the freedom of information bill on which we spent only one day of debate, because it was a worth-while piece of legislation and there was general agreement in principle. There were some differences with regard to some measures in the bill, but a general agreement in principle.

As the result of agreement between all parties, a House order was introduced today with respect to an important bill to amend the Excise Tax Act. I say to the Minister of State for Finance that he ought not to imply, as I believe he was coming very close to implying, that the government is beside itself because it has a great legislative program which it must get through.

If the minister was classifying the borrowing authority bill, to borrow \$14 billion which will be laid on the backs of

S.O. 75c

Canadians, as one of the pieces of legislation which just must get through, then I take issue with him and the implication in his speech, and with the statement by the government House leader that the government just cannot tolerate the delay. The government has said that the precedent for their actions is that I did the same thing when I was government House leader.

I imposed closure after five days of debate on a bill which was quite different. This borrowing authority bill does not confer any benefits on Canadians. It confers a \$14 billion debt on the taxpayers. It loads onto a tax system which is already loaded. It is so loaded that out of the total outlay of government expenditures of some \$67 billion, approximately \$12 billion constitute the debt charges as the result of the government's borrowing. One fifth of the total government expenditures constitutes debt charges. That money does not come out of the air; it comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. The government must repay that money with interest. This bill is of no particular benefit to Canadians, because the government has not outlined an economic program. I contrast closure, limitation of time, shortening the debate, or what have you on this occasion, with the benefit which we as the government sought to incur in the bill in respect of which we were forced, by reason of repetition, to introduce closure. That bill, the property tax credit bill, stood in the name of the then minister of finance, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie).

The property tax credit bill would have allowed home owners the benefit of such a tax credit. It was introduced in a period of time when interest rates were not as high as they are today and the difficulty of owning a home was not as apparent. It was at a time when AHOP was at least still working, even though we were warned it would not work and that people would walk away. It was not a time when people were walking away from their homes because they cannot carry the mortgages because interest rates are being doubled upon renewal. This is the situation in my constituency, in Toronto, in the constituency of Brampton-Georgetown, in southwestern Ontario or Saskatoon, it is the result of high interest costs which are caused direct by the economic policies of this government. At the time, we were in government and, because we wanted to confer a benefit on Canadians, we felt we had to use Standing Order 75c. There is no benefit being conferred on anybody by this bill, none whatsoever.

**Mr. Evans:** What about the principle?

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** I understand the necessity even though the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) does not understand.

**Mr. Evans:** I understand the principle.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** The hon. member does not seem to understand the difference between a piece of borrowing legislation which would impose \$14 billion in debt upon the system and the property tax credit bill which would benefit a property owner.

**Mr. Evans:** It is irrelevant to the principle.