## Motion under S.O. 75C

were allowed to speak all we wanted. Debates on the estimates were unlimited. But what has happened in this House? Today the estimates go to committee. Sending them to committee is as good as sending them to Timbuctoo.

There is a rule that you can only ask questions and receive answers for ten minutes, which means you never get answers and therefore you have no way of putting pressure on the government. So that right has gone. If estimates get to the House, there is allocation of time on interim supply and supplementary supply. You cannot get any answers at that time, either. Now, with this contentious issue before the House, the minister wants to cut off debate on that matter also. What a sad spectacle is this House of Commons! I have only been five months here, but this is not the House of Commons I was led to believe we had in Canada. Perhaps it is true that the people of Canada do not hear what is happening here. More is the pity.

All this chamber is now is an appendage to the press gallery. Once the question period is over, that is it, and what happens in the House in the rest of the time does not matter to the public or to the press. That is the only reason hon. members opposite dare bring in this closure motion. It is because they feel no one in Canada hears whether or not the House is debating an important issue. They believe the media is interested only in the question period, and they believe they can get away wih anything. That is why they brought this motion before us.

I have been waiting now for six weeks to have my turn to speak on this piece of legislation. It first came to the House on February 1. The debate continued on February 2. The bill did not come back until February 25, and then it was again before the House on February 28. Only one of the seven Newfoundland members has had a chance to speak on this bill. Is there a Newfoundland member who will not speak on this bill, who will not attempt to change the provision, to change the eligibility from 8 weeks to 12 weeks? All seven Newfoundland members of parliament will speak on that and I hope they will be heard whether in committee or in the House on third reading.

Seven days were spent on the income tax amendments. Two half-days, a full day and three half-days were spent on old age security. Three full days, plus Friday and Wednesday, were spent on the immigration bill—but no closure was brought in on the immigration bill.

Mr. Maine: There will be.

Mr. Crosbie: That tells us the story. The minister says closure will be brought in.

Mr. Maine: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was not the minister who said it; it was I who said it will be brought in.

Mr. Crosbie: In that case, the coat-tail is telling us what the coat will do. There will be closure on all these other bills.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: On the human rights bill one full day and two half-days were spent. There was no closure on that. I thank the minister for naming me as one of the reasons for his closure motion. If this is not the weakest excuse that has ever been given, then I do not know one. This really takes the cake. To clinch his argument for closure he said the hon. member for St. John's West has threatened to filibuster the passage of the bill. It is wonderful for a fellow like me, the most junior member of the House, to be known like this. I did make that statement on February 10 at the time I was admiring the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) in his struggles for his beliefs. I did happen to say that if the hon. gentlemen opposite did not accept some reasonable amendments, I would do all I could to see that they did, and I would filibuster if necessary. I repeat that statement. But I have not even spoken in the debate. How could I be the excuse for the closure motion?

I see in the Globe and Mail of today that the hon, member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has said he will delay passage of the human rights bill unless we get substantial improvements to it. Does that mean that, automatically, closure will be introduced on the human rights bill because the hon. member for Peace River is quoted in the Globe and Mail as saying he will delay things until there are improvements? What kind of thin excuse is that? The minister says that this is not closure, that it is just the guillotine, an allocation of time. The only time, he says, we will give MPs to debate this bill on second reading is another five hours to add to the 13 hours they have had. Those are the Indira Gandhi tactics. Indira Gandhi comes before the fall. In our system we still have an election to come. We do not have to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to let us have an election, although it may come to that. But we are not doing so yet. We still have that election coming up, and the electorate of Canada will emulate what has happened in India, and "Indira Trudeau" is going to go the same way.

## Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: This bill takes \$28 million out of the pockets of some 16,500 Newfoundlanders who will be dropped from the rolls in an area that has an unemployment rate of at least 25 per cent, an area where it is difficult in many cases to find work for eight weeks of the year. Many people there will not be able to get that work, and there is no assurance that the \$28 million, or anything like that, will be put into manpower programs or training schemes in the province because objections have been raised to it by the government of Newfoundland. In the midst of our tragic unemployment, the minister wants to do this to the unemployed in Newfoundland and the Atlantic provinces. I quite agree to being strict with regard to who is eligible and who is not, and to cutting off from the rolls those people who are not entitled to be on them, and to tightening up the administration. But to arbitrarily drop this guillotine on the maritimes and in Newfoundland at a time of tragically high unemployment and a waste of human resources, with a government that is doing nothing to improve the situation, is something I cannot accept.