

Time Allocation for Bill C-11

● (2022)

I bet there are not ten members on that side of the House who have read the bill and I bet they do not fully realize that the proposal they are now blindly endorsing is only a suggestion to have a tax credit in 1978. We feel it would be preferable to have it now. We believe a tax credit of \$100 should be given now. What is wrong with members in the House showing their concern about the government's proposal to tax life insurance in the form that is proposed in Bill C-11? Why should we be cut off from expressing our views on that provision in Bill C-11?

I should like to point out half a dozen other matters. For example, what is wrong with members expressing their view on the fact that this government needs a further debt borrowing authorization of \$9 billion in spite of the fact that only last spring it sought a \$7 billion borrowing authorization increase? Those are the types of things that members have been dealing with in speaking on Bill C-11. What is wrong with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) making a clear argument as to why he feels the farm roll-over provisions, certainly from the corporate side, are inadequate? I thought he made a forceful argument.

What is wrong with two or three of my colleagues pointing out that the so called SIN system could be easily changed if the government saw fit? Now is the time to do it under Bill C-11.

In short, I think that some basic arguments have been advanced by members of my party as to why this bill should be considered further. We believe that more thought should be given to it, and surely nobody would disagree that the proper time to express these views is on second reading, and that is what we have been doing. Instead of listening to members of the Liberal party supporting this incomparable, incompetent government, I hope that we will see them tonight stopping to act like sheep and standing up to vote against this closure motion, as we will.

Mr. Ed. Lumley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, having sat through every minute of the debate so far on Bill C-11—I believe I am the only member in the House who has done that, and also having read the record of every single debate on this bill—I am amazed at the comments I have heard in the past hour and 45 minutes from opposition members. I do not know whether I have heard more rhetoric in this two-hour debate than I heard on Bill C-11 in total.

When the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), as did some of his colleagues, indicated that there has not been enough time to debate the tax bill, let me point out that from March 31 or June 1 there were six days spent on the budget debate to start of the discussion. Then there was debate on the Speech from the Throne which lasted another eight days. A great percentage of that discussion was based on the economic situation in the country, but still they have not said anything worth while.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. Lumley: In the second reading debate on Bill C-11 we have had nine days with extended hours which, as the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Cafik) has pointed out, is equivalent to 11 days. So up to now we have had 26 full days of debate.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe said that there has not been enough discussion on economic problems in this country. My minister, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien), has been in the House 19 of the 22 days of sittings in this session and has fielded 60 questions on the economic situation in the country. If the opposition has not had enough time to date to debate the economic problems, I feel very sorry for its members.

Mr. Woolliams: What a weak argument.

Mr. Lumley: Hon. members on both sides of the House have indicated that one of our greatest problems with respect to our economic situation is lack of confidence. I believe that speeches made by the opposition members in the debate on this bill totally undermine confidence in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lumley: A distinguished journalist from our press gallery commented after their conference in Quebec City several weeks ago—I think he called it “Canada bashing”. Obviously the debate we have heard here in the past hour and a half has not contained one positive statement from the opposition.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe spoke a minute ago about time allocation. Perhaps he will recall that in the last budget the government introduced time allocation both in committee of the whole and again at third reading. The opposition House leader, for example, indicated today that that is not what he hears in his riding. What I hear in my riding is, “What are you doing up there? Who is running the government? Get on with it and cut out the rhetoric in the House”.

An hon. Member: That's good coming from you.

Mr. Lumley: The rhetoric is not coming from this side, Mr. Speaker; it comes totally from the opposition benches.

In the last nine days the opposition has tried to bootleg the RCMP into the budget debate. If opposition members are so interested in discussing economic matters, why have they not stuck to commenting on the proposals in Bill C-11? Why have they diversified and talked about everything under the sun but economic matters? I can only think of one word for it, namely, rhetoric. When the opposition House leader goes to his riding, as I do, I am sure he hears just the opposite of what he said in the House today.

Let me set the record straight. For example, the NDP has indicated six or seven times that Bill C-11 allocates \$1.2 billion in tax incentives to corporations as well as to the wealthy. I would like to set the NDP straight on this. First of all, approximately \$500 million under Bill C-11 goes to per-