

*Time Allocation for Bill C-30*

and cease to exist? I certainly hope that is not the case, but that is what will happen unless Bill C-30 passes.

This bill is necessary or it would not have been brought forward. The bill asks the permission of the House for the government to borrow additional moneys to keep it going during the interim period until a new budget can be brought down, until an energy pricing agreement can be reached, and until the envelope system can be well-thought-out and put into place. That is what the government is asking for and it is reasonable.

The estimates handed down by the previous government and reintroduced by this government, though they do not represent our spending plans, until supplementary estimates are brought in are our spending plans. These estimates clearly indicate what will be done with the \$12 billion. The expenditures and revenues are clearly represented in those estimates. If hon. members opposite will read the estimates they will recognize that this is what they were faced with when in government.

The people who watch us daily and who read what is going on in the House of Commons are becoming a little disturbed that progress is not being made with bills that are really not matters involving philosophical differences between parties. Hon. members opposite know that, had the Conservative government been put back in place, this bill would have been introduced by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), or whoever would then have been minister of finance. This bill does not involve philosophical differences but rather is a matter of keeping the government running.

It is time we stopped this fooling around and got down to the business of moving forward with the important issues that have to come before this House. There are many such issues. I just need to hold up this particular package again to indicate the number of issues that need to be debated in this House. These are Commons bills. We have had 12 hours of debate and we will have one more day of debate on Wednesday on this bill that contains two paragraphs. Certainly it refers to \$12 billion. If they look at the estimates handed down by the last government hon. members will find that this is \$12 billion that they would have requested.

We are proposing this motion under Standing Order 75C in order to get this matter before the committee where specific questions can be asked and detailed answers can be given. In this way we can move on with the business of governing this country and quit this horsing around.

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** That was a great piece of rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, devoid of any content whatsoever. One of the previous speakers mentioned the fact that we repeat things in this House over and over again. Let me take a local example of the radar at Victoria international airport. We have repeated the facts of this situation over and over again. In spite of that, when we speak to the minister he

says: "Well, isn't there radar at Victoria international airport"? They do not listen.

It is high time we looked at some of the philosophical bases on which this Parliament works. Let me read just a few words in this vein. These are not my words but are taken from a document, the authors of which I will deal with in a moment. It is a perfectly respectable report to this House, and the first chapter begins as follows:

Accountability is the working principle of our parliamentary system and a process whose effective functioning is essential to our democratic government.

Those are very fundamental words in respect of this particular debate—accountability, the parliamentary system and democratic government. This particular closure motion brought under Standing Order 75C is a denial in these circumstances of the accountability of the parliamentary system and of democratic government. The government refuses to let us know the reasons it is asking for authority to borrow \$12 billion.

● (1630)

**Mr. McDermid:** It's a nice round figure.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** It is a round figure. As the hon. member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) mentioned a few minutes ago, it was the entire expenditure of the Liberal government when the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) assumed office. The figure has now reached the point where they are talking about \$56 billion or \$60 billion.

One could reflect on just what this amount of money means. Attempts have been made in this House to define billions of dollars. I have worked out one way. If one were to stack one thousand dollar bills one on top of another until one reached \$1 billion, the stack would be higher than the Peace Tower. That is merely \$1 billion. Twelve of these stacks one on top of the other would amount to a stack which would be 3,800 feet high.

**Mr. Simmons:** How about dimes?

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Such a stack would probably amount to a little more than one kilometer. That is a lot of one thousand dollar bills. Without a proper debate, a proper explanation or a budget, that is what we in this House are being asked to approve.

That quotation I gave was taken from the Lambert report that was tabled in this House in March, 1979, and it goes on to say at page 370:

Parliament has three tasks to perform, to legislate, to grant supply and authorize the levying of taxes, and, ultimately, to support or replace the Ministry.

As part of its granting of supply:

Parliament's responsibility . . . is the continuous scrutiny that it is empowered to maintain over the government's implementation of the measures to which Parliament has given assent.