

of advice I received from the hon. member for Yukon when I got back. I feel very much alive and very happy to be a part of this particular party.

However, I say to the hon. member, my friend across the way here, that if we do not find a better system, we will lose the confidence of the people, and we will make the House of Commons in effect irrelevant. Federal-provincial conferences, ministers' meetings, regulations, newspaper comments and all kinds of things will take precedence over the House of Commons unless we get the focus back here where it belongs.

For my part, if I were a minister of finance, there would not be an earlier lock-up. The Minister of Finance would deliver his speech on the night of the budget and let all of the Canadian people hear the comment, and then deal with them after. That is only a minor thought, but it seems to me that if we have a budget which is being presented by the Minister of Finance and it is meant for the Canadian public, surely it should not be discussed out here two minutes after the Minister of Finance is on his feet.

I heard a comment by Dian Cohen. She was almost drooling over the idea that she would be able to get out there and attack this particular budget. Two minutes had not gone by after the minister stood up.

An hon. Member: She's on your side.

Mr. Cullen: If Dian Cohen is on our side, we are picking the wrong friends.

An hon. Member: You're learning, Bud.

Mr. Epp: Better take what you can get.

Mr. Cullen: I think we have had good representation in some areas of this particular budget. I think the insurance industry, particularly the Canadian life underwriters, have been responsible in the kinds of representations they have made. They are a very well organized group. They know how to approach their policyholders. They have come up with some ideas which warrant consideration. It is my personal view that no one really purchases life insurance for the purpose of saving. If one wants to save money, one will do it in a different way. That is something we can consider, and that is why I welcome the minister's indication that this was an area he was prepared to consider.

I would like to refer to capital cost allowance. Here is an area in which there is no reduction in the capital cost allowance, but in the first year we are saying to Canadians, "You cannot have a full capital cost allowance. It will only be a portion of that. But you will stretch it over a longer and more extended period of time." There is nothing wrong with that approach.

Mr. Taylor: Do you have a farm?

Mr. Cullen: As the minister indicated, and as anyone who has studied this knows, in the United States the capital cost allowance does not commence when one buys a machine. It

does not commence until one begins using the particular machine. That is when the capital cost allowance begins applying.

Mr. Taylor: That's what happens on farms!

Mr. Cullen: Our system will still allow a capital cost allowance but it will be spread over a longer period of time.

Mr. Taylor: Oh, baloney! Did you have a farm? Did you have a farm?

Mr. Cullen: If the hon. member would listen for 30 seconds and let me finish my point, which he has not had the courtesy to do—

Mr. Taylor: Tell the farmer that when he is buying a combine!

Mr. Cullen: One cannot deal with a dinosaur in the House of Commons. I guess that is the way it works. I will just carry on and ignore him.

My view on the capital cost allowance is that it may impact on people who are leasing equipment.

Mr. Taylor: Oh, baloney!

Mr. Cullen: Because here is an area where an individual buys a car at the beginning of the year or leases it through the whole year, and there is a capital cost allowance feature in the first year which may be appropriate, and I think is something we should be considering.

Mr. Taylor: You fellows tell your farmers that!

An hon. Member: Easy does it, Gordon. Watch your blood pressure.

Mr. Taylor: Tell your farmers what he is saying!

Mr. Cullen: I think the hon. member must have worked in a big field because we can hear him all the way across the back forty. There was a time when we understood that we would be courteous in the House of Commons and at least listen to what another individual had to say; but he is a new hon. member in the House, and I guess he has not learned his rules yet.

Mr. Stevens: You should listen to him. He's right, Bud. Listen to him.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I understand that under the rules, and they are still being debated here, I would have approximately one-half hour in which to speak; but I know other hon. members want to make comments. However, I feel very strongly that there must be a better way to present a budget, one in which there is more input prior to the budget coming in than after the budget is already introduced. It is apparent to me as a person who loves this place, the House of Commons, that, as with every other single piece of legislation, a minister must bring that piece of legislation to caucus and get it