

able amount of time to talk about the principle of Bill C-30 on second reading.

Madam Speaker, there are 282 members of the House. These are the 1980s, a time when more legislation, coupled with a reshuffling of the electoral ridings and an increase in population have raised the number of members proportionally or just about. We are already 282 members and the standing order limiting speeches has not yet been amended. For second reading, it provides forty minutes, an unreasonable time in 1980, except that the first speaker following the mover of the motion is entitled to forty minutes; in this case, it was the hon. member for St. John's West who, not satisfied with using outdated Standing Orders and, therefore, with using forty minutes, which is somehow inappropriate in 1980, given the large number of members in the House, he nevertheless took one hour and 37 minutes of the time of the House, of the time of Canadian legislators, to speak only to the principle of this bill, and this at only one stage of the bill. I say this is an injustice, it is unacceptable and it explains the measure currently taken by the government simply to limit the debate on second reading of this bill so that it can be studied sooner in committee to give other members a chance to have the floor to express their views.

Madam Speaker, we have here a striking example of an abuse of the Standing Orders. We have here a striking example of the need to change as soon as possible at least the orders dealing with the length of speeches in the House. We have talked about it many times since the beginning of this session and we will hear a lot more about it. I do hope we will be able to do something very soon about it because some hon. members do not show reasonable restraint as our colleagues in England do, even though there is no written rule to limit the length of speeches, and where civilized people very seldom exceed ten minutes, out of respect for their colleagues and to give them the opportunity to express their views on any legislation. Here, when someone uses one hour and 37 minutes in a second reading debate, I say that is unacceptable and that the government is—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

● (1510)

[English]

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Madam Speaker, had the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen), who opened debate on this bill, spoken for a decent length of time and given us some information and a promise as to when he will bring in a budget, then this debate would not still be going on. We are not going to be forced into accepting this legislation now or ever until this government gives us a date for a budget and tells us what its economic and financial approach is going to be to the problems of Canada.

It was six months ago that the Minister of Finance claimed credit for authoring the defeat of our budget on December 13. Six months later and after three months in office, the Liberals

#### *Time Allocation for Bill C-30*

cannot indicate to the people of Canada what their economic and financial solutions are or what approach they will take to governing this country. Investors do not know what their position is, and neither do the people. They have heard rumour after rumour and suggestions of tax increases.

The same group which was complaining last fall because we intended to introduce an excise tax on gasoline is now going to do away with indexing of income tax and really give it to the lower income people of Canada. They are going to impose a tax at the refinery level, which means a tax not only on transportation fuels but on heating fuels and products which are used in the petrochemical industry. And on it goes. The government is afraid to come into this House and bring down a budget. That is why we are opposing this bill.

This bill authorizes the borrowing of \$12 billion. The House leader has complained because we have spent under 12 hours discussing this bill at second reading—\$1 billion an hour. It is a credit to the people of Canada that the government wants us to rush this bill through the House in less than 12 hours, \$12 billion in credit. We are not going to do it. The government House leader says that the government was very generous with the time it allocated for this bill. The government is very generous with the credit of the people of Canada.

The government House leader says that they are not imposing closure. This is garrotting. This is the gag, the noose, the stiletto, the bastinado. This is the sledge-hammer, the bludgeon. The government House leader is right when he says that it is not closure. He talks about the principle of the bill. It is not the principle of the bill; it is the "unprinciple" of the bill and of the actions of the hon. gentlemen opposite which are upsetting to us.

The government House leader has asked us to rush this bill through. It is like asking the goose and the turkey to help lay the Christmas table. We are not going to do it. We have debated this bill for three full days, one afternoon and 20 minutes one evening. There have been 21 speakers—three Liberals, a waste of time. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Evans), though, gave us a few facts. There have been four NDP speeches which were almost a waste of time, and 14 PC speakers with not a wasted minute among them.

What do we want, Madam Speaker? We want the Minister of Finance to come to this House and bare his soul to us. We do not want a four or five-minute speech in which he says nothing. What are the bold, new economic directions for Canada? This gentleman goes outside the country and makes speeches. We want him to explain. For example, he has just been to a meeting of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and this is what he said in a speech there on June 4:

● (1520)

But the experience of the 1970s has brought home the point that we are unlikely to achieve a sustained improvement in employment unless we get inflation under better control.