

Mr. Taylor: It's a waste of time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair does not work from lists. I should make that very clear. Speakers do jot names down as a general guide, but we do not operate on the basis of lists. Parties supply to the Chair a list of Hon. Members who wish to speak so that a Speaker may be aware of the names of Hon. Members put forward by each Party when their turn comes for debate. However, strictly speaking, there is no list. In any case, I am guided by the wisdom of the previous occupant of the Chair. I was advised to recognize next the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka.

I am prepared, if there is agreement in the House, to recognize another Hon. Member, short of making a formal motion, which I think would be quite legitimate but disruptive.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I think it is regrettable that this matter is being raised when there is a very limited period of time before a vote takes place.

Mr. Fisher: That's exactly the point.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, you gave the floor to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. He legitimately has the floor. The Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher) has no right to attempt to take it from him.

Mr. Roberts: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to draw this matter out very long either. However, is it not the normal practice at this stage of debate to alternate between the Opposition and the Government side? It does seem to me to be the procedure which is generally followed. The Hon. Member on this side was on her feet and ready to speak, and it seems to me that Your Honour is in the unfortunate position of having come into the Chair in the last few minutes and are therefore perhaps not really quite sure of what had happened before. Should we not really follow our normal practice of alternating Hon. Members from one side to the other?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I think we want to be fair. We heard a Liberal speak, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia), then we heard a P.C., then a Liberal, then a New Democrat.

Mr. Fisher: Now we are back over here. That's normal.

Mr. Taylor: Quite often the movement has been this way, and we have let that go on several times. I do not think the Liberals should be wasting our time now simply because the Speaker did come our way this time. The other time it was the Government's way.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, on the same point raised by my good friend, the Hon. Member for Bow River, I would point out that if, at any time, the Speaker has moved from the NDP to the Conservative Party and back, it is because the Government has not seen fit to have one of its Members speak in between. However, we are entitled to our opportunity to speak.

The Budget—Mr. Darling

I know that the Hon. Member for Montreal-Mercier has put a good deal of work into preparation of her speech for this time.

Mr. Taylor: So has our man. He has been sitting here all afternoon. Your Member hasn't.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. If there was any unfortunate and, I assure Hon. Members, unintentional mix-up in the order of speakers, the Chair will assume full responsibility. However, I would like to quote from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, Page 111, wherein Citation 121 states:

There should not be a list of Speakers with an order of precedence in the House of Commons. Any Member who wishes to speak may rise and endeavour to catch the Speaker's eye.

The eye of the Speaker was caught by the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I apologize to the Hon. Member for Montreal-Mercier, but we would have had time for the Hon. Member to contribute to the debate. In any case, having recognized the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, I must invite him to pursue his remarks.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, after wasting some ten minutes or more which I believe could have been used by the Hon. Member for Montreal-Mercier (Mrs. Hervieux-Payette), I am delighted to have the opportunity to say a few words on the budget. As has been pointed out, there are another two days in which to debate, and I am sure the Hon. Member will have an opportunity to stand and speak in the House.

• (1720)

First, let me cite some of the positive measures in this budget before I get to some that might not be quite as flattering and perhaps a little more negative. From the vantage point of hindsight, some measure of congratulations are due to the Minister for producing what is unquestionably the best budget since the restoration of "Pierre the Last". I was going to name it, after Allan Fotheringham, "The Liberal Reincarnation", but in the interest of accuracy it might be more perceptive to speak of it as their joining the ranks of the undead.

However, to say that this budget was an improvement over the efforts of the Minister's predecessor is in the same order as saying that public health statistics were showing a remarkably positive trend the summer after the Black Death. I have no doubt that that is exactly how a Liberal Government would have described it.

The budget has already been described as a "buy now, pay later" budget. Its ultimate epitaph will probably be "it could have been worse".

For the moment let us put aside the fact that the entire thrust of the document is to further postpone payment to the piper until another Government is in place to take the heat. It is a matter of a "Government on credit", and we will look at its attendant effects later. I am certain that is true because we are all aware of the polls that came out today that showed the