

## S.O. 75c

cent response to the poll on the Constitution. Our \$100 billion-plus budgetary deficit is an anchor against progress. You have to sell and you have to spend, but you have to take in more than you spend, and that is axiomatic. We need a chance to discuss this matter fully and openly, as we should discuss the Constitution. All I can say to the government is: show intestinal fortitude over there and vote against it.

## [Translation]

**Mr. Henri Tousignant (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, for quite a while now, five days to be exact, we have been discussing Bill C-59 to provide authority for the government to borrow the required sums of money for its most basic operations. I fully realize that this exercise is necessary and in accordance with the spirit and the realities of our parliamentary system, and that in effect it guarantees the protection of our democratic rights and thus the proper management of the affairs of the state.

That being said and agreed upon, Members of Parliament and the public in general will no doubt recognize that although this is a necessary and useful exercise, members opposite have abused the time made available to them by introducing arguments of doubtful relevancy into the discussion which only serve to foster all kinds of statements which do not promote in any way the advancement of political science, Mr. Speaker, nor for that matter the consideration of Bill C-59.

**An hon. Member:** They do not realize it!

**Mr. Tousignant:** I am absolutely astonished that members opposite should act so innocently when the government proposes to limit debate with the agreement of all parties. I almost fell off my seat when I heard the comments of the former government House leader under the Conservative government of 1979; I was flabbergasted, because that is certainly not what he said at that time. Here, for instance, are some of the things the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) said when he was government House leader, and I quote from *Hansard* of December 7, 1979:

Also we are hearing from the other side of the House great appeals to parliamentary democracy and that we are destroying it, I should like to indicate to the hon. member that I know it is the kind of thing I used to say when I sat on the other side of the House of Commons.

What a hypocritical statement!

Having watched a former government claiming abuse of the rules, let me say that if I ever had any doubts about the importance of Standing Order 75c, those doubts were blasted away by the actions of that party. . . . We do not intend to allow the opposition to put the government into that position, or to so ruin the proceedings of the House of Commons that the people of Canada cannot get the piece of legislation which the government promised during the last election.

● (2040)

[English]

I would like to read what the House leader of the former government, in 1979, had to say.

**An hon. Member:** Who was that?

**Mr. Tousignant:** The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker). This is what he had to say:

As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) said, I am a patient man. I do not want the Liberal party to try such a feeble argument that they can appear to be co-operative on the one hand and obstructive on the other. I want them to be known for what they are—obstructors. They have proven this today.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Translation]

**Mr. Tousignant:** Mr. Speaker, what more can we say? Where is the sincerity of those so-called defenders of our parliamentary traditions? Of course it helps a bit to understand their generalized frustrations. Remember all the time they waited to form the government. All of a sudden, through sheer accident, they are swept into office but they cannot hang on and power slips through their fingers. Canadians did not waste any time to decide that important issues could not be left in the hands of children. As we have all seen in the past, the people, of course, cancelled their right to govern. We have all seen dogs running after cars and we are tempted to ask ourselves what they would do if they caught up with them. When we look at the people across the floor that is the impression we get. Frustrations, Mr. Speaker. We have to sympathize with them. They were given the chance to form the government but were so careless that their fellow countrymen had to tell them to their face, no we cannot let you go any further, you no longer have our confidence. And so today they want to appease this passion brought on by their defeat. The official opposition simply and deliberately goes out of its way to criticize every move made by this government.

You have to see how far they are prepared to go to throw the country into confusion and chaos. For instance, how did they attack our energy policy? Can you imagine, they accused us of being socialists. Mr. Speaker, 72 per cent of the capital of oil companies operating in Canada is foreign capital, and it leaves the country with 22 per cent of net profits. So we in the government—

**Mr. Lalonde:** You mean 82 per cent.

**Mr. Tousignant:** The hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) says 82 per cent. That is correct.

This government assumes its responsibilities, knowing as it does that those resources belong to all Canadians, yet hon. members opposite rake us over the coals throughout the country. It is the same thing with the Constitution, Mr. Speaker. If they wanted to be just a wee bit sincere—they know that very well—and tell the truth, Canadians from one end of the country