

*Time Allocation for Bill C-30*

weeks ago of the official opposition in Committee of the Whole when we had four ministers simultaneously answering questions, I do not think they will be able to get their act together. We have given them that opportunity. There is no question of trying to cut down debate, of trying to limit an hon. member from expressing his or her views in the House.

**An hon. Member:** Sit down, then.

**Mr. Collette:** I have ten minutes. The hon. member for St. John's West used his ten minutes. We have been most reasonable. I see the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) is here. A couple of weeks ago I stood in my place and asked for unanimous consent to extend private members' hour to the full hour because government orders had intruded by about 20 minutes into private members' hour.

We are quite reasonable. We are mild-mannered people. We are good natured. As Henry Higgins said in "My Fair Lady", we have "the milk of human kindness by the quart in every vein". I would sing it, but I do not think I should. We are quite reasonable.

Hon. members opposite have to look at their position in the debate. They talk about everything. They are still fighting the last election. I do not blame them. We had the spectacle on Friday of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) going to Toronto cap in hand, or whatever the expression is, and pouring forth his heart to Bill Davis and all the provincial Tories. He was wrong, he said, they should not have allowed that vote to happen on December 13. We can understand the sensitivities and sensibilities.

I do not want to ram anything down anyone's throat. As I said, we want to be mild-mannered and reasonable. We can understand when the Leader of the Opposition makes a public display of pouring out his heart, much like a group therapy session. We do not want to rub it in any further. The government is quite within its rights, not just technical and legal rights but within its moral rights to bring in 75c.

**Mr. Knowles:** No.

**Mr. Collette:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says no. We have the rule on the books. It is a rule that has been used at some times with extreme caution. The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton used it in this very House only a few months ago. It is there for specific situations when urgent business has to get through the House. I think we are doing hon. members a favour.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Collette:** We should be able to go back during the summer recess and say to our constituents that we had a very productive session. However, if we allowed Bill C-30 to be debated ad infinitum, we would be here all summer. I do not think any member should hold up the debate or filibuster solely out of pique, if it is pique, or solely because he disagrees with the principle of the bill.

In the United Kingdom, second reading is done within a day and all questions are put. How long does it take you to state your principles? Do you have to state them ad infinitum, like the hon. member for St. John's West? I do not think so. I am in agreement with using 75c and I welcome the opportunity to get this legislation through.

**Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I want to bring the parliamentary secretary back from this trip to Fantasy Island.

**Mr. Nowlan:** He didn't take the "Love Boat", he used a scow.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** This is very important. In his last utterance he talked about the importance of the principle of the bill. The principle of the bill is quite clear; it is a very easy principle. It is a desire and an attempt by the Government of Canada to borrow \$12 billion.

The minister comes to this Parliament and asks for permission to borrow \$12 billion. However, he has not recognized the purpose of this Parliament. Its purpose is not to put a stamp automatically, like a clerk, on a requisition for \$12 billion. The purpose of this Parliament is to ask the ministry why it needs the \$12 billion.

When an official of the Department of Finance is reported publicly as saying that there may be no need for the full \$12 billion, the government should be satisfied and should carry on its business with something less, at least for a time. The Parliament of Canada is then entitled to ask how much less. Why did the government choose the figure of \$12 billion in those circumstances?

Sometimes in these debates two things happen. Sometimes the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) or his parliamentary secretary, and now we have a Minister of State, Finance (Mr. Bussi eres), stand in their place during the course of the debate and tell Parliament why they need the money, or what is happening to the economic situation in the country that will require them to need the money. Sometimes they do that and sometimes they don't.

● (1550)

This is one of the occasions on which the government, for one reason or another, which I think is in keeping with exactly the same theory on the operation of government as we saw when they promised a bill on freedom of information—and we don't see it—comes to Parliament and says: "Parliament, you are the handmaidens of the government, we do not have to tell you anything, we will do what we please; give us the bill".

That is the issue in this debate, but the background of that issue is important because we face an unusual government. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the beginning of the Thirty-first Parliament when the Liberal party was in opposition. The then financial critic, now the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gray), moved that the issue with respect to interest rates be the subject of examination by a parliamentary committee. The government of the day, the government of