

able to co-operate on small bills, bills that require no great discussion, bills that should have been through in half the time—half the time that was taken on Friday in the case of some of them. But when it comes to major bills, the opposition wastes time.

I need not talk about Bill C-19, the employment tax credit, which we will be getting to later tonight. But when member after member rise from the official opposition benches and talk about everything under the sun, such as their constituencies, their grandmother, their ailments, everything except the content of the bill, that is wasting time.

The hon. member for St. John's West talks about the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) not saying anything. When the Minister of Finance spoke in this debate a couple of weeks ago, he said more in five minutes than the hon. member from St. John's West said in an hour and a half in debate on the bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Collette: In fact, I would ask hon. members to check *Hansard* for the days when the hon. member for St. John's West was speaking. I think hon. members will find that the same speech was given today in a truncated form. The hon. member is like a musak tape: it plays over and over again until one changes the tape. We have heard it so often and we heard it again this afternoon.

The official opposition ruminates and fulminates about this terrible rule. They call it closure. I would like to remind members opposite that on December 5 last year, a scant two months after Parliament had opened, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) rose in his place concerning Bill C-20, the mortgage tax bill. I think the bill was in Committee of the Whole stage. They talk about arrogance on our side, but after second reading had been granted, one day after bringing Bill C-20 into Committee of the Whole, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton, as reported at page 2149 of *Hansard*, said this:

● (1540)

Closure was used by C. D. Howe and it became an infamous rule of the House in the flag debate. It was the initiative behind the debate to ram changes in the rules of the House down the throats of members. I do not intend to do that today. What we are using here, and I think we had better make it clear to the people of Canada, is time allocation under the provisions of Standing Order 75c. This is a far gentler measure.

That is what he said on December 7. I agree that what we are doing here is trying to expedite the business of the House. The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton knows, as do all House leaders, that time must come to end debate. This is an important bill. We are talking about borrowing \$12 billion for the Government of Canada. We need to have this bill put through very quickly. I will not cite the whole myriad of things that will happen if this bill is stalled any longer. The government needs this bill. I think we are fully justified in bringing in 75c.

I think we can have some fun looking at the record. Later on the same page the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton said:

Time Allocation for Bill C-30

I have only done this because there is no end in sight to the debate, none whatsoever... I do not think Canadians should be shortchanged by a short-range government and a short-range opposition.

The people of Canada did not realize how short-range that government was. In looking back, we can only thank God that on February 18 the voters of Canada took a very wise and just decision.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Collette: I do not want to be cruel because, when you get right down to it, I am not a bad-natured guy. I do not want to go any further with the record in that debate and quote all the words of the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton. After all, the government House leader and I have to deal with him on a daily basis, and generally we have a very good relationship. But on matters of principle and urgency affecting the government and legislation, we have to be blunt. That is the reason I looked up these words today.

Comments have been made in the House in the last few minutes that we are not reasonable, that we cut off debate, that we do not allow people to speak. We had seven days of throne speech debate when any member could talk about any single matter under the sun, not just matters relating to the throne speech debate. We had several days on second reading of the employment tax credit bill. I class that as a small bill as it was not one that was really controversial; in fact, the opposition will probably vote for it. We had two days in Committee of the Whole on interim supply.

The opposition rant and rave about not having adequate time to express themselves. Perhaps you were here those two days, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House when the official opposition could not get their act together. They needed more speakers. They wanted more time in Committee of the Whole. They have all the time in the world, but they cannot plan properly.

I am not criticizing the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton but his members do not listen to their House leader. There was debate on Friday afternoon when someone objected. They did not listen to him. I say to hon. members opposite, "Listen to the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton; sometimes he is right".

Let us talk about other provisions that we will have this year when members can adequately express their feelings and points of view. We have arranged by unanimous consent a most imaginative supply order covering this year because the regular supply order is inoperative as a result of two federal elections.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Collette: Hon. members agreed to it. There was great patting of each other's backs because everybody got together. In the fall there will be ten opposition days. Six will be in Committee of the Whole. On three of those days the hours may be extended through dinner until midnight. There will be plenty of time. However, after seeing the performance a few