

Time Allocation for Bill C-11

clause by clause study, and that will take perhaps several more weeks.

It seems hard for me to believe the opposition really wants to debate this bill on second reading for many more days when we have already debated it for nine days, especially when there are so many good things in the bill which the Canadian people are waiting to see adopted and put into legislative form. Yet we have to use a time allocation motion and use up two or three additional hours today debating whether or not we are going to limit debate on the bill.

Some hon. member mentioned this afternoon that if this bill had been introduced in the House of Commons in the mother of parliaments at Westminster, it would have had only two days' debate at the most and then be sent to committee of the whole and be passed, though perhaps with extended sittings. Be that as it may, we have spent nine sitting days on the bill, with extended hours. In addition, in his statement on the economy during the throne speech debate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) spent a great deal of time dealing with the provisions of this bill.

I cannot imagine why the opposition does not want to see the provisions in this bill implemented. For example, we have the provision to cut taxes by \$100 during the first two months of next year, at a time when consumer spending is often down. This tax cut would provide stimulus to the Canadian economy to the tune of \$700 million, and 7.5 million taxpayers in Canada would benefit. In view of that provision I cannot understand why the opposition does not just pass second reading of the bill so we can go into clause by clause study. There may be a couple of t's to cross or i's to dot, but we can do that during clause by clause study of the bill.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, the \$150 million which the minister mentioned in his economic statement will create more direct jobs this coming winter. This is in addition to the \$450 million provided by the manpower program of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) last year and will total this year and next year over \$1 billion for direct job creation.

That is the kind of active, positive program for which the Canadian people are asking. That is why the Tories have sat on that side of the House year after year after year. All they want to do is talk, talk, talk, not take action. What the Canadian people need, Mr. Speaker, is action, and this government wants action so it can pass this bill and implement the tax cuts for which Canadians are waiting as well as the investment tax credit which will create jobs.

Let me point out to the House that one very important aspect of this investment tax credit is that it provides an additional 2.5 per cent investment tax credit, making a total of 7.5 per cent, for slow growth areas of Canada. This is an important change and is an indication of the kind of commitment which the government has to the slow growth areas of our country. It is the kind of positive action that the government wants to implement, action which has already created some 254,000 jobs during the year October, 1976, to October, 1977.

[Mr. Foster.]

Looking back over the six years between 1970 and 1976 we see that Canada has a pretty impressive job creation record compared to other OECD countries. According to the OECD report last summer, the average increase in Canada was 3.2 per cent during these six years from 1970 to 1976. On the other hand, the increase in the United States of America was only 1.8 per cent, in Japan 0.5 per cent, in France 0.4 per cent, in Italy 0.4 per cent, and in the United Kingdom 0.1 per cent. West Germany is often held up to us as the country that has very low unemployment and inflation, yet their actual job creation picture showed a decrease of one per cent averaged over the last six years.

I recall about a year ago meeting with a representative from Switzerland who was talking about their very low inflation rate during 1975, which he said was about 4 per cent. This was at a time, Mr. Speaker, when we in Canada were facing an inflation rate of over 10 per cent and had to implement the wage and price control guidelines. I asked him how Switzerland accomplished such a low rate. He replied, "Well, we had a minus 7 per cent growth rate in our economy in 1975". I asked him what had happened to their unemployment rate, and he replied, "It did not really go up because we sent about 200,000 of our employees home to other countries in southern Europe". Of course, Mr. Speaker, that does not really solve the problem, it just exports it to some other countries. Therefore I suggest Canada has really had an impressive growth rate during the last six years in terms of jobs, certainly the best of the OECD countries.

There are other reasons why we should get on with this legislation. The Standing Order 75C motion which is before the House tonight does not pass this legislation; it gets it past second reading stage only. We then go on to clause by clause study which could well take several more days, even a week or two. If it should go on for much longer than that we would get to the position where this parliament, which opened on August 18, would have passed only one bill before Christmas, a pretty poor record, one that we would have to lay at the feet of the official opposition.

There are other important pieces of legislation waiting to be passed, such as amendments to the Combines Investigation Act and the competition bill which will ensure that consumers are fairly treated and that the market place is healthy and productive. Canadians should have a very competitive market place. We look at the labour standards legislation—

● (2012)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Johnston) on a point of order.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, in the midst of this ill-prepared and unprepared—

Some hon. Members: On, oh!