

Time Allocation for Bill C-11

House concerning this bill. I for one think that it is a shame that the business of the people of Canada cannot be dealt with in the House or, at least, go through the various stages in the parliamentary system.

Frankly, I am not the least surprised to hear that the people of Canada are worried about the parliamentary system when I see the opposition and more particularly the Conservative party take nine days to repeat, speaker after speaker, the same thing 27 times over.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many times we have to repeat what we say in the House.

[*English*]

I find the comments of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn) very difficult to follow. First of all, he gives this rather grandstand performance about members on this side not having an opportunity to discuss the legislation before the House. I take it from his remarks that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar, in the several years he has been in parliament, has failed to understand the parliamentary system. This is unfortunate. For example, we on this side of the House have meetings with the minister, as do members on that side. We have an opportunity to discuss these matters with the minister, without taking up the valuable time of this House of Commons.

I think the Canadian people would be interested to learn that the Canadian House of Commons sits the second longest number of hours of any chamber in the democratic world. Yet we have a legislative program which is continually disrupted by the opposition. It is no wonder that the people of Canada wonder—and I am sure, having seen us on television, they are wondering even more—just what it is they are sending their members down to Ottawa to do, when they hear the same speech made by members of the Conservative party 27 times. Twenty-seven times we have heard the same old, sad story.

They do not have the sense to assist in the passage of a matter of such importance as a tax bill which is designed to create demand in the economy and give a \$100 tax cut which will be of benefit to over 7½ million Canadians. The Conservative party is not even interested in sending that kind of legislation to committee of the whole. When members talk so bravely of going to their constituencies and hearing what they have to say, I hope their constituents will tell them that there are issues which are more important than the RCMP, about which we have heard nothing but for the last three weeks. We are interested in getting on with business of the House and improving the economy. What we would like is some co-operation from the opposition parties.

We are trying to stimulate private investment and create jobs. Therefore, we would like those people who want to invest to have some idea where they stand. But not the Conservative party; they do not want to give these people any idea where they stand. They would prefer to talk, talk, talk in this House, always saying the same thing. I have looked through some of the speeches which have been made over the last nine days of this debate and have concluded that hon. members opposite must have only one speech writer. I do not believe there are 27

different lines of thought, so they must have one speechwriter whose speech has been given 27 times. When they go to their constituencies and try to explain why their constituents cannot make the kind of investment decisions which are needed in order to create jobs, I hope they are also prepared to explain why they make the same speech 27 times.

Following the advice of the government, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into the bill before the House, because what we are trying to do is to get Bill C-11 into committee of the whole so it can be discussed in detail. How can you deal with members who contradict themselves? On the one hand, for three weeks they have been downgrading the RCMP; on the other hand, they do not want to deal with the real issues in this country and the economy; they only want to talk about them. It is the old story, Mr. Speaker—they do not want to do something, they only want to talk about it, and they say the same thing 27 times. Frankly, I think that is a disgraceful performance.

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear a member for whom I have some regard make such foolish remarks in the House as those made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. Since I have a decent regard for him, I shall not refer to him further during the few minutes at my disposal.

We must be taken to understand, from the fact that the government has brought in closure, that the government have tremendously important, world-shaking legislation on the other paper of this House that they are dying to have the House pass. Otherwise, why would they try to rush through this legislation which really encompasses two budgets? One was brought in by a wolf in sheep's clothing when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) spoke in the throne speech debate several weeks ago. The other budget was brought down by a wolf who has now become a sheep and who will be going off, we understand, at the end of the month to McCarthy and McCarthy, where doubtless he will restrain his demand for greater compensation in the interest of government policy which he has been espousing in the last year or two.

Just what is it for which we are waiting with bated breath, Mr. Speaker? What is this fantastic legislation which will change the face of Canada and which the government wants to have passed by putting closure on the income tax amendments? As far as we know, there are two pieces of legislation. One is CALURA, not "coloratura", or whatever it is, which we hear over in the National Arts Centre, but CALURA—which has to do with amendments to labour legislation and is of infinitesimal importance. I say it is laughable, Mr. Speaker. Having brought forward that piece of legislation, I can see hon. members opposite committing collective hari-kari—and I will supply hon. gentlemen with the knives if they want to do that.

The other world-shaking piece of legislation which will rock this House to its foundations, and which justifies our being televised, is legislation having to do with petroleum corporations, legislation that will tell the oil companies that they have to do what they have been doing for the last 18 months, but