

*Time Allocation*

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) that I did not interrupt the Hon. Member for Laval-des-Rapides (Mr. Garneau) during his speech and ask him to show me the same courtesy. Hon. Members should show their consideration for their colleagues by not interrupting them. Liberal members should teach that lesson of elementary courtesy to each other and to their backbenchers.

I should like to mention also the \$1 billion they wasted in the de Havilland fiasco. And finally, the biggest waste of them all, the \$2.1 billion they invested in Canadair. This means that the Liberals wasted altogether a total of \$3.5 billion during the last few years they were in power. Their past record is so lousy that they are not in a position to tell us what to do, Mr. Speaker.

Our Government is proposing a solution for our Western banks. The Liberals proposed nothing when the Caisse d'entraide économique were faced with similar problems in the province of Quebec. Just as so many ostriches, Mr. Speaker, they buried their heads in the sand. They preferred not to see the problem. They ignored it. I am well aware that the Caisses were under provincial jurisdiction, but the Liberals could have tried to help them just as we are trying to help these Western banks, for we feel that this country extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They will be responsible for any delay in adopting this legislation. The House is going to adopt it in spite of them and I want them to stop all these innuendoes about the so-called failure of the Canadian banking system.

I urge the NDP, if it wants to maintain its footing in Western Canada, to support this legislation.

● (1140)

[English]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, this House is being asked to agree to a motion which will choke off debate on second reading of one of the most important Bills which will ever come before this House under this Government or any other Government. Yet we have had only four days of debate, less than 11 hours, to discuss this Bill which asks Parliament on behalf of the Canadian taxpayer to approve the expenditures of \$827 million—almost \$1 billion.

The Government House Leader did not give any persuasive reasons why the House should accept this motion to gag Members of Parliament and to cut off debate on this Bill.

[Translation]

And certainly the Conservative Member who just finished his speech did not provide any arguments to support the situation and convince us to adopt this motion. He referred to the National Energy Program, but the Hitchman Report has pointed out that the National Energy Program had no connection with the problems of the Canadian Commercial Bank, none at all! The Hitchman Report clearly indicates that the

banks' problems were related to bad management by the banks and not at all to the National Energy Program.

The Conservative Member was complaining about the deficit but wants the House to support a measure that would add one billion dollars to that deficit. The total bill for this bank fiasco will add not just one but three billion dollars to the deficit, and the Conservative Member wants the House to support this motion and this Bill? The Hon. Member also referred to measures to help certain Canadian companies survive, but these Canadian companies were known to the public. They were known to Canadian taxpayers. And now, the Hon. Member and his colleagues want to keep secret the identity of those who will be saved by the legislation being provided by the Conservatives!

[English]

The principle of this Bill is that almost \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money should be spent to reimburse people whose identities will be kept secret. That is so contrary to a basic principle of parliamentary Government that we must oppose this motion and we must oppose this Bill. A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons published a book entitled *House of Commons Précis of Procedure*, under the authority of the Clerk of the House of Commons. On page 61 is found the following, and I quote:

Second reading is the most important stage in the passage of a bill. It is then that the principle and object of the bill are debated and either accepted or rejected.

The Conservatives want to choke off debate after less than four days or 11 hours of debate on what is understood to be the most important stage in the passage of the Bill. This Bill is shocking. It is contrary to the basic concept of a parliamentary Government that money should not be voted unless we know for what and for whom this money is to be spent.

It is obvious, and not just from this motion, that the Government wants to hustle its problem away from the spotlight of Parliament as quickly and as fully as possible. At the beginning of September when the Government announced the failure of the Canadian Commercial Bank—the first failure of a bank in 63 years, and it happened under a Conservative Government—it said it was going to set up a joint committee of the House and Senate to look into the matter. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) said that we are not only going to do that, but we are going to televise the proceedings. However, as soon as the dimensions of the fiasco which was brought about by the Conservatives, became clear, and as soon as the dimensions of the responsibility of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson), the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall) and the Prime Minister himself became more and more evident, the Conservatives suddenly began to cool off, saying, "Perhaps we should not have a joint committee. Perhaps a committee of the House would be important enough". And when we began to try to ensure that the committee would work so that we would have the information we require, the Conservatives backed off again and in one day, all of a sudden, a royal commission of inquiry was set up. A royal commission