

openness and more accountability. We have had none of it so far. Of course, we have seen what the guidelines have done. They have created almost a travesty of any system of open government under this gang so far. Hopefully in the next few weeks or few days the Tories will learn their lesson.

We do not want to have to get our data from briefs left by Ministers in hotel rooms. We want to get our data and our material here in the House and before the committees. So far we have been singularly unsuccessful in doing that.

I would like to make reference in closing to one more short passage from this article in *The Atlantic Monthly*, which I believe the Minister has read. Everybody in the financial community read it at the time. The statement at the end by Stockman reads:

Whenever there are great strains or changes in the economic system—

This Government itself has certainly created strains and changes in the economic system.

—it tends to generate crackpot theories, which then find their way into the legislative channels.

That is what I am worried about. That is my greatest fear, that we will see crackpot theories finding their ways into legislative channels before this House. If they do, it is our job as an Opposition to ensure that those crackpot theories are not imposed or inflicted upon an unsuspecting public. We have to do that job, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Before concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to propose something to amend—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member has 40 minutes—

Mr. Johnston: I do not think I will need them, Mr. Speaker, for this is nothing but an arrogant request. I do not feel I need 40 minutes to deal with such a request.

I merely ask the House to accept my amendment, which is reasonable in view of the evidence I have just given to the effect that the request before us is utterly preposterous.

● (1540)

[English]

I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson):

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word 'that' and substituting the following words:

'this House will not proceed with a Bill to provide borrowing authority for a fiscal year for which the Government has not provided complete details of spending requirements or revenue projections'.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Blenkarn: They can't do that.

Mr. Andre: I should like to bring to the attention of the Chair, if I am correct about what the Hon. Member is attempting to do, that I believe the amendment is out of order. A motion that the Bill be given second reading is very limited

in terms of amendment. If the Chair will look at the precedents in this regard, I think it will conclude that indeed this amendment is out of order.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Andre) to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, page 226, under the heading 'Reasoned Amendments', where the following appears:

It is also competent for a Member, who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a 'reasoned amendment'. This amendment leaves out all the words in the main question after the word 'that' to add other words. A reasoned amendment is in the form of a motion and many fall into one of several categories:

Some of the principles are that the amendment must strictly relate to the Bill and that the amendment must not be concerned in detail with the Bill. I suggest that the amendment is quite appropriate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): At first blush I would like to say that the amendment appears to be in order. I would like to take it under advisement, carry on with the debate, and later this day come back with a ruling.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I had difficulty believing my ears in the last two or three minutes.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Riis: I can recall absolutely crystal clearly, vividly, not many, many months ago in this same Chamber when the Party of the Hon. Member who has just spoken stood in the House and asked Parliament to consider exactly what the present Government is asking us to do. At that time speaker after speaker rose in their places and explained the need for this proposal. They explained why this was totally appropriate. Then, one after another, members of the opposition stood in their places and explained that it was unacceptable. As a result of a long battle, the then government came to its senses and realized that in fact it was not an honourable thing to do.

To see the finance critic for the Liberal Party, in just a matter of a handful of weeks, standing in his place with indignation and asking how the Government could be doing what they themselves did just a few short weeks ago is the kind of behaviour which makes people question how serious members of the Liberal Party are. They say one thing one month and something totally different another month. That is why the people of Canada, when they had a crack at them, said that they had had enough of this crazyness and two-faced politics. Having had enough of their saying one thing one day and one thing another, they said: "We are going to kick these folks out of office so far they will never come back". And that is what they did; that is exactly what they did. With this kind of behaviour they are ensuring that that process will continue.

It is unbelievable that that man, the finance critic, can stand there and smile and laugh. That is why the reputation of politicians is on the same level as, I suppose, child molesters almost in the country, or tax collectors.