

Time Allocation for Bill C-30

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, what we are engaged in today is, to my mind, a demonstration of what appears to be the consensus of this House that speeches need not extend beyond a limit of ten minutes. I trust that if this matter does come before the committee to which the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) referred within the next few days we can start from the basis of that consensus rather than work from the premise that certain members of the House need extended time in order to put a few ideas before the House and before the public.

I am particularly concerned that the hon. member would stand in his place and suggest he has such a deal for the government today. If the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) would stand before this House and give him but a date, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton would be prepared to allow this bill to go forward. I was listening rather attentively before the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton rose to speak because it has been my experience in this House that you cannot listen to just one person opposite to determine what it is hon. members opposite are really after. If you do that, you find yourself running a fool's errand. If you give in first on one item, then you find there is one more thing they want and after that just one more thing. I would not stand in my place and support a government which would give in to that kind of pressure—I am almost willing to say blackmail. This government has been elected to govern this nation and not to give in to the power play tactics of members of an opposition who refuse to support bills or who support them so that they can buy something for themselves.

● (1600)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Daudlin: To get back to my point, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton said that if we would but give him that date, he would assure us that his party would no longer stop this bill. That says two things. It confirms what the government House leader and the parliamentary secretary before me said, and that was that the opposition is systematically stopping this bill from going forward for no other reason but simply to stop it. That should not be allowed to continue. The hon. member said, "Give us a date". The former minister of finance, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), said, "Give me the date, and we will be prepared to allow this bill to pass". However, then he had second thoughts about that and said that in addition to the date he was concerned about what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) was doing about oil prices. Already we see the hint that if we were to give a date, hon. members opposite would not be satisfied with that and we would have to give in to something else. I am sure hon. members in the New Democratic Party would then want to jump on the same horse, and they would raise their particular pet peeve.

The people I have the joy to represent, the people of Essex-Kent, and others sent this government to Ottawa to conduct the affairs of this nation as best it saw possible. The people of Essex-Kent thought that all men and women sent to this House were honourable and capable of sitting down and negotiating what is required so that things could happen in this House. The people sent us here believing that men and women of good will can sit down and negotiate to a conclusion which benefits the nation. When I go home, people ask why we sit and listen to people talking on a bill hour after hour seemingly with no direction. Why is it that there seems to be no particular relevance in the debates? Why is it that we seem to hear the same things being said again and again?

I can tell from the look on your face, Mr. Speaker, that you have gone through the speeches and said to yourself: "I have seen this before. Surely this is nothing new. My goodness, surely some other hon. member has said this before". When we go through the speeches, we find that that is exactly what is going on. It is *déjà vu*. We have seen it all before, and that kind of thing should not be allowed.

If we were limited to ten minute speeches like we are today, and if we were forced to come to the issues before us and the principles of bills and tried to divorce ourselves from repeating what has gone on before, we would find that a debate could be completed in a day and all the new ideas could have been brought forward. That is the kind of thing I think we should be moving toward.

During his short intervention the hon. member for St. John's West spoke about rumours and rumours fueling rumours. It is interesting to hear that because one is forced to reflect on the source of those rumours. We hear opposition members in this place day after day saying not that some minister or some hon. member but some mysterious person from the bureaucracy has been floating some kind of an idea. Some servant of the public has said such and such and "Is that not a terrible thing, and does that not mean that the government is going in certain directions?" I have a great deal of respect for this House, and what we should do first is listen to what the ministers of the Crown are saying in this House. That is the direction which is being given in terms of where the government of the day is going. We should not be going to *The Globe and Mail* on the fifth page to determine whether some idea is being floated or whether there is a rumour. We should be sitting in the House, listening and determining from that what the direction of the government is, and we should be debating it.

Hon. members opposite talk about the government not pressing forward by giving them a budget in the time frame they would like. It is interesting, is it not, that we had an election on February 18 and that we were back in this House on April 3? However, that is not good enough. Immediately the opposition says we have to do better. They forget the election of May 22 and coming back to this House on October 8. We had to wait until December for a budget.