

follows: if the Minister of Finance agrees to appear before the committee before six months, then we remain within the spirit of what is allowed under the rules to move an amendment, and I wonder why the Chair favours or seems to favour that form of amendment and fix a six-month time limit. If, according to the rules, we are allowed to delay the second reading of a bill up to six months, I do not see why we cannot be allowed to move an amendment to suggest a condition under which second reading could take place before the six months. We on this side of the House have presumed that the Minister of Finance will be courageous enough to appear before the finance committee well before those six months.

Now, as a solution, it would be that much simpler if the Minister of Finance were to stand up tonight and say that he is prepared to appear before the finance committee ahead of the governor of the Bank of Canada.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I realize that it is not easy to move a reasoned amendment according to Standing Orders. I have been in the chair many times in recent years and very few hon. members, except perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), once, and also I believe the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) on another occasion, have managed to find a way to move such an amendment which was acceptable.

However, I must still apply our Standing Orders, which are based on the fundamental principle that the amendment must oppose the principle of the bill, and secondly, that the amendment must not include any condition aimed at preventing second reading of the bill. In the present case, the amendment does exactly what it should not do on both counts. There are also the other questions that I have examined concerning the operation of the committees and the fact that the hon. member has not succeeded in convincing me and did not even work very hard at it. I must therefore reject this amendment.

**Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to speak about Bill C-10, but first of all I wish simply to say that I hope that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) and the government will learn something from what has happened in the House today. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance and the government think that they will be able to play the clowns and give replies such as the one they gave this afternoon to the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), who had asked a very legitimate question after our party had stated that it was ready to grant unanimous consent to allow a motion to be moved which would really have helped the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Baker) to administer better the affairs of the House, then they are wrong. We said that we were ready to agree to that motion. We had granted unanimous consent even though we had not been notified beforehand. A private member, the hon. member for Vaudreuil, rose because he wanted to ask the following question: can the Minister of Finance now say whether he will

testify before the finance committee and accept his responsibility for the financial policies of this country? Will the Minister of Finance tell the committee what he will do about the monetary policy of the governor of the Bank of Canada?

The Minister of Finance only played the clown and replied, "I shall come to the committee when I have the time and when I am in town". I must tell the Minister of Finance that if he wants to make some progress in the House, if he wants his colleague, the President of the Privy Council to be able to administer the affairs of the House efficiently, he should treat the members of Parliament as equals and reply to the questions asked by members on this side of the House like a Minister of Finance should do. I would also like to tell him that because of this, I have noted this evening that Bill C-10 requests the approval of the House to borrow \$7 billion. I believe that if this is the attitude the government will adopt when myself, having been a member for eleven years and having taken part for five or six years in the works of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, I had the opportunity to see the hon. member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), the hon. member for St. John's West himself and other Conservative members at the time when they formed the opposition, come before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs and, facing a bill as simple as this one, after the House of Commons had already accepted the principle of giving authority to borrow the money, spend hours, days, and weeks in discussions, I want to tell the Minister of Finance today not to think that other members on this side of the House and myself are going to accept stupid answers, answers from a Minister of Finance who thinks he can afford to show arrogance in the House of Commons like the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) last week who arrived—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Breau:** Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Perhaps it is a good time to call it ten o'clock.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Lefebvre:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to put a question to the government House leader.

● (2200)

[English]

Can the government House leader tell us what the order of business will be for tomorrow?

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, we will be proceeding with amendments to the Post Office Act tomorrow. I presume we will not have the intemperate display of obstruction we observed from hon. members just a few moments ago,