

*Time Allocation for Bill C-30*

every question then necessary in order to dispose of second reading stage of the bill shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. When this debate was interrupted at five o'clock, the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Cousineau) had the floor.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Cousineau (Gatineau):** Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted at five o'clock I was pointing out the particular fondness the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) has for the word "budget." In my view, his unyielding and profound eagerness to have this government present a budget is inconceivable and exaggerated.

[English]

It took five months for the Conservatives, when in power, to convene Parliament.

**An hon. Member:** Four.

**Mr. Cousineau:** It took seven months for them to present a budget, yet now they ask this government for a budget after three months. How serious can they be? I must admit that the Conservatives certainly know the ways and means necessary to remain in opposition for 16 years.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Cousineau:** Hon. members opposite will have a chance and perhaps will find a solution next February. In the meantime—

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, other members of Parliament have followed the ex-minister of finance, four from the NDP, two from the Liberals and 16 for the Progressive Conservative Party have discussed this bill. And is it not the member for St. John's West who, last May 28, complained of the fact that on October 23, 1979, when he was minister of finance, he had asked for a similar authorization? How fast he forgets. He did not mention this fact this afternoon. He complained of the fact that the opposition, nine Liberals, seven NDPs and two Conservatives had commented on the measure discussed for four days. Now the shoe is on the other foot.

During this second reading debate on Bill C-30, we have had 11 hours and 47 minutes of discussion and I sincerely believe that the speeches and observations of members of the opposition have touched upon all aspects of this bill and that this House could not be apprised of any new fact in my opinion which could be of some use to the Canadian population. For we should be thinking of the Canadian population. I congratulate the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) who has put forward this motion pursuant to Standing Order 75c.

Last Friday, I heard some members of the opposition use such words as shame, arrogance, closure, and in my opinion they should start getting used to the expression "limit on

debate" and "waste of time". The government has taken its responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, and the Canadian people expect decisions to be made by this government even though members of the opposition do not see it that way.

To let the speeches continue at this point, Mr. Speaker, would be tantamount to shirking our responsibilities because I am told that 27 other Progressive Conservative members had indicated their intention of speaking on this bill. To bring in new facts? No, repetitions. I do not know how many NDP members would want to speak, but if 27 Conservative members were to do so, they would have the right to speak for 40 minutes each and we would have in this House 18 hours of debate, repetitions and filibustering, Mr. Speaker. If that bill is not referred to committee immediately, we will not be able to deal with the other legislation this government wants to bring in for the better being of the people of Canada. We are here to administer the country and that is exactly what we intend to do. The tactics of the opposition, whether the NDP or the Progressive Conservatives, may be considered by some as ways of expressing legitimate criticisms but, for others, nobody can deny that those tactics can and must be considered tactics of filibustering.

**An hon. Member:** That is right.

**Mr. Cousineau:** Mr. Speaker, what are the real intentions of opposition members in prolonging the debate? What objective are they pursuing? If the intent of the opposition, and more particularly members of the Progressive Conservative Party, were to prolong the debate to discuss this bill fully, if the intention of Conservative members were to bring out all the aspects of the bill and examine it under all its facets, that would be very legitimate intention.

But that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, that is not what is happening. After the speech by the former finance minister, the hon. member for St. John's West, what we heard was for a very large part imitations, *déjà vu* and always the same old things. The opposition already cried: Shame, and if the opposition talks about closure, I must say we have no intention of letting ourselves be affected by the blackmailing the former leader of the government engaged in this House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude here because time is flying. Let me conclude by saying that it is the duty of the government to organize things and to thwart some. We are not through thwarting them, and organizing the proceedings. The government has the duty to organize the work of this House and to look after the initiatives that are taken here. That is what we are doing now and that is what we intend to do for the next four years.

[English]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being 8.10 o'clock p.m., the two hours provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House under the provisions of Standing Order 75c have expired. Accordingly, under the terms of the