

*Motion under S.O. 75C*

For the government to turn around and give us only 13 hours to discuss this bill is shameful. The government does not want the bill properly discussed because they know there are members in their own ranks who will not tolerate the passage of the bill in its present form. It is an insult to the 30,000 unemployed Newfoundlanders—that is, the official unemployed—and the many other thousands who are no longer trying to get work because they know it is hopeless, and to the 932,000 unemployed in Canada, for the minister to have moved this closure motion and to have allowed such a short period of time for debate of the bill.

We are to have only five more hours to speak on this bill. I agree with the closure device which the opposition has the right to oppose. The opposition has the right to oppose to the government, and the government has the right to govern. But surely a bill of such importance should be debated for two or three weeks before closure is introduced and before it could be said that the opposition is unnecessarily obstructing the progress of the government.

**Mr. Maine:** You have had two or three weeks on every bill.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Not every bill has been as important as this one.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Hon. members opposite do not care about unemployment.

**Mr. Paproski:** Shame on you.

**Mr. Maine:** That is untrue.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Crosbie:** What could be more important than a bill which affects one million unemployed? I do not want to interrupt anything. The minister said the other day that this was tyranny of the minority. He said he was subjected to the tyranny of the minority. Tyranny is the despotic or cruel exercise of power. Has anyone seen this opposition exercising power since 1963?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Crosbie:** How could it be tyranny of the minority, a cruel exercise of power. The oppressive and cruel ruler is the minister, and he spells out his colleagues and the Prime Minister who are going to shove this through the House of Commons. The minister has a heavy burden. His senses are leaving him altogether when he pulls out a chestnut of this kind and says he is being subjected to the tyranny of the minority. That is a dangerous attitude. Apparently the opposition is the tyrant and the government considers itself to be fighting the tyrant. The government considers itself to be the one which is weak and under attack and it is prepared to do anything to preserve its position. That phrase illustrates a dangerous attitude on the part of ministers opposite. They do not know even today where the tyranny is. All they have to do is to look at their own benches. I will be happy to vote against this tyrannous piece of eunuchism.

[Mr. Crosbie.]

**Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to rise to speak on the motion brought forward by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) exercising Standing Order 75C to limit the balance of debate that will take place on this bill on second reading. Since 1968 I have been a strong advocate of introducing some degree of order and proper planning into the procedures of the House. When this time allocation procedure was introduced into the rules, I welcomed it.

● (1600)

The only limit to my joy with respect to that provision is the few times that it has in fact been used. I think it is reasonable and proper, in the modern world, when governments have many legislative measures which they have to bring forward, to use a time allocation procedure. There is no question that the allocation of time is viewed by the opposition with a great deal of abhorrence, but I think it is very much misunderstood by the press. For instance, today's *Montreal Star* says on the front page, "Closure axe poised for UIC debate". Today the *Globe and Mail* refers to closure being used in this debate. I can understand the opposition wanting to use the term "closure" for political reasons—

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Is the *Montreal Star* your opposition?

**Mr. Cafik:**—but it seems to me that it should at least be the responsibility of the press to call this measure what it is: time allocation. There is a distinction, and it has some meaning. I do not think it is reasonable to call it closure per se. Nonetheless, it does have a limiting effect on debate, and that is the very purpose of Standing Order 75C.

I support this measure, particularly at second reading of a bill which is agreement in principle. Second reading sends the bill to the committee stage and there hon. members from all sides are free to bring forward amendments, reasoned or otherwise, in the hope of adjusting the bill to accommodate their own particular objectives. The sooner bills get to that stage of deliberation in the legislative process, the better it is for everyone in this House because we are then given an opportunity either to support or reject bills in whole or in part, or to amend them.

Frankly, I have never really tried to hold up bills I have not supported at second reading. I can understand having a more substantive debate at report stage if hon. members feel that they have not got their way in committee and want to register their objections by filing amendments for the second time at the report stage and to carry on the debate at great length at that time. I can also understand hon. members being frustrated because they do not achieve their objectives at the report stage or at the committee stage and trying to tie up a bill at third reading. But to tie up a bill at second reading—at its very beginning of the legislative process—in my view does not make any sense.

Hon. members opposite talk about the small number of members who have participated in this debate. I believe the number so far is 26. If my calculations are correct, and if there