

Mortgage Tax Credit

that there is life after death but proof of nothing else as far as a democratic principle is concerned.

I think it is extremely important that we make it perfectly clear as to why we in this party are not going to be supporting this amendment. The simple reason is that although we are in favour of a sunset provision on this matter and although we are not in favour of the mortgage tax credit as it is presently designed—nor are we in favour of a filibuster and the kind of malarkey we have been hearing from the Liberal party all afternoon which has had nothing to do with the amendment put forward—we are concerned about the fact that the last word in this matter would be left not to a resolution of this House but to a resolution in the Senate, which is completely unacceptable, I suggest, to any member of the House of Commons who is concerned about control of supply. For that reason and for that reason alone we shall be voting against the amendment.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in hearing the speech—or the semblance of a speech—by the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood. While he may be concerned about turkey marketing boards, he should remind himself that we do have on the books an egg marketing board, and he may want to be concerned about that.

Mr. Hogan: You are laying one now, Herb.

Mr. Breau: I recognize that at this time in our political history the New Democratic Party is on its way down. It is obvious from its popular vote in Ontario last time that it does not have anywhere to go. Members of the New Democratic Party say they are for good legislation and that the House of Commons should have an opportunity to review legislation once in a while. The Tories have decided to ram this bill through the House and not provide for more than one day's debate in Committee of the Whole on such important legislation. After the Tories complained for years that when we were in government we were stifling Parliament and bringing in the guillotine, on the first important legislation they bring forward they do the same thing.

That once again is a sign of Tory hypocrisy, and to see the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood supporting the Tory party in opposing this kind of amendment is really something which is disconcerting to me. Even if the New Democratic Party is going to be wiped off the political map of Canada, I thought that at least its members would go down with their heads high. However, obviously in their old days—

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I think the hon. member is certainly straying away from the amendment which has been proposed, and I suggest he follow the wording of the amendment, please.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about the amendment of my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry, to clause 1, which would give the House of Commons and Parliament an opportunity after the first year

[Mr. Rae.]

of operation of this legislation to review it and provide that the government would have to pass an order in council and have Parliament either approve or reject the application of this legislation for subsequent years. I find it very difficult to understand—and this is what I was saying—that the NDP could support the Conservative party, the government, in opposing such an amendment.

The reason we want this kind of amendment to this bill is that we are very concerned—contrary to what one hon. member of the Conservative party said a while ago—that this bill will not be a bill which will stimulate construction. This is not an effective stimulative instrument at all. If the Tories want to stimulate housing construction, stimulate the economy or stimulate any kind of construction, the most effective way to do that is through a reduction either in sales tax or an across-the-board tax cut. That is the way effectively to stimulate the economy of Canada in a real way. It is not done through this kind of legislation because the people probably are not going to get this tax credit before next May, June or July. Can the government say right now what the state of the economy is going to be in June or July? This is not an effective way at all. The Minister of Finance should have brought down a budget last June or July, and he could have included in it an effective instrument of economic stimulation, but he did not do that.

● (1630)

Another reason we want this act reviewed under the sunset provision is that we want to make sure that in the second, third or fourth years this kind of push to the construction industry does not do exactly the opposite of what the hon. member of the Conservative party said this afternoon it would do. It might happen that at that time there will be increasing inflation in the economy and therefore, as the Minister of State (Treasury Board) apparently said a couple of days ago or said in the statement which was issued from the office, that is why he was in favour of a sunset provision in such cases. How can a minister of the government, a member who used to speak so independently and so eloquently on any subject when he was on this side of the House, now be tamed so quickly by the Minister of Finance? Apparently he agrees with this kind of provision.

Speaking about ministers, let me point out that one of the reasons we want this matter reviewed by Parliament in subsequent years is that we are very concerned about the injustice and the inequity that this system will bring about in our taxes. Throughout the time I have been active in politics I have thought that the role of government in society was to help those who need help the most. Some of us were encouraged by the fact that members like the hon. member for Egmont made it to the cabinet, even to the inner cabinet. We are happy that members like the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands became Secretary of State for External Affairs or that a member like the hon. member for St. John's East was made a member of the cabinet, or that the member from Newfoundland was made Minister of Finance. However, these people have been completely shut out by the real people who run the Tory party, such as, presumably, the President of the Treasury