

Time Allocation for Bill C-30

not for \$12 billion. Not until the minister can tell us exactly what his plans are and when his budget is coming down.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) has to stop this shameful equivocation—his bullying and bullying of the provinces—get down to serious negotiations and come in with a sensible oil price proposal. We know that it will probably be more expensive than the one we offered last December. The hon. gentleman should face up to the fact that they cannot carry out their commitments to the Canadian public. They cannot tell falsehoods, lies, and get away with it any longer. There are serious economic and financial problems facing this country.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The time of the hon. member has expired.

Some hon. Members: More, more!

Mr. Crosbie: Guillotine!

Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Madam Speaker, at the outset may I say to the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) that in spite of his unkind allusion to the speeches made by four members of my party in this debate—an unkindness that I am sure he did not intend—I can tell him that we are as strong in our opposition to this motion as is his party. We think the action of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) this afternoon is an abomination.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Shameful.

Mr. Knowles: When the vote is called on this matter tonight some time after eight o'clock, we shall be voting against the motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles: If the government is able to get enough of its members here to carry the motion, there is one thing I hope the minister will not do. I hope he will not use a motion which provides one more sitting day for the debate on second reading of Bill C-30 to call that debate on a Wednesday.

Mr. Pinard: Why not?

Mr. Knowles: Because there is such a thing as fairness and decency around here.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles: I object very strongly to what is implied in that question from the President of the Privy Council. In other words, he has it in mind, having got the authority of the House on a vote tonight to conclude second reading debate with one more day's debate, to do it on a Wednesday, which is a short day.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Knowles: That is compounding the abomination. The President of the Privy Council likes to stand up here and refer to rules 75A, 75B and 75C as though they were the gospel truth, as though they were something that the House wrote into the rules with pleasure and with unanimity. I can tell him that is not true at all. I can tell him that in November and December of 1968 the government of that day tried to get through a closure set of rules under another number and heading but had to withdraw that set of rules to get the rest of its changes through before Christmas of that year. Not satisfied, the government of the era came back in June and July of 1969 and brought in rules 75A, B and C and pushed them through with its majority. The rules do not express the views of the House of Commons generally, which is what ought to be the case with respect to the rules that govern this place.

If my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council and others over there want to know what Liberals used to think about closure rules, I invite them to go back to 1913 and read the ringing words that Sir Wilfrid Laurier used against the Tories of that day who stopped a debate in the middle and brought in a closure rule. Here we are again, in the midst of a debate on Bill C-30, and the government brings in this closure rule.

● (1530)

The hon. member for St. John's West is quite right in pressing the point that the most serious offence about this is that we are being asked to close off debate, the basis of which is government spending, at a time when we have not been given a budget or any indication of what the government's financial policy is.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles: If ever there was a case of asking this House to sign a blank cheque, that is it. We think it is wrong and we have no intention of going along with this desecration of the parliamentary process.

It is interesting to watch some of the things that happen around here. This afternoon, the President of the Privy Council stood up and told us how unco-operative members are on this side. He singled out the member for St. John's West for having spoken for an hour and 37 minutes at one point. I know that the member for St. John's West was embarrassed that he had to cut off at that point, that he was unable to establish a record, that he was not able to surpass the record established some time ago by John Rodriguez. But today, as I say, we are told that we are so terribly unco-operative on this side. However, I remind the President of the Privy Council that on Friday of last week his parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collenette), had this to say in the middle of the afternoon:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the clerk said and I am sorry that there is some confusion this afternoon.