

attitude, coupled with the untruth I have suggested that unless this legislation is passed before December 31, somehow we are robbing the Canadian taxpayer of a benefit—and that is an untruth because, as hon. members will know, the legislation provides that it should apply in 1979 regardless of whether or not it is passed in 1979, so that it can be passed in 1980—

Mr. Jarvis: Be practical. When are they going to file?

Mr. Rae: Let me suggest to the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations (Mr. Jarvis) that he has created the problem by mailing out the forms prior to passage in Parliament.

Mr. Kempling: You haven't been around here long enough.

Mr. Rae: The chief whip, in his usual style, suggests that I have not been around here long enough. Perhaps some people have been around for so long they have forgotten the most elementary basis of parliamentary government, a matter that goes back to the origin of Parliament in the seventeenth century, that the control of supply must remain with the House. I would point out that the control of supply does not remain with the government, the Queen's Printer or whoever has to publish the tax forms.

● (1650)

If it is a question of holding up the mailing of tax forms for an extra ten days, I suggest the government has its priorities all wrong. It would be far better if Canadians understood that debate took place in Parliament, and that as a result of the debate a delay took place in the submission of a piece of legislation to this House. It would be far better if Canadians understood that, as a result of that debate in the House of Commons, there was a delay of a number of days in the sending out of tax forms. I submit there is absolutely nothing wrong with that. To suggest otherwise is to mislead the Canadian people. It is to tell the Canadian people that the Queen's Printer and the government together are dictating not only the schedule but the measures and legislation which will be passed by the House before we have had a chance to consider them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Céline Hervieux-Payette (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, after having witnessed Friday last the show given by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) allow me to give my opinion a little more soberly on the subject matter of Bill C-20, an act to amend the Income Tax Act to provide a tax credit in respect of mortgage interest and home owner property tax. In that area as in many others, the Progressive Conservative government has tried to improvise rather than develop a housing policy. It wanted to meet three objectives or promises; first, keep one of its election promises made on the basis of surveys; second, give the necessary impetus to construction to

Time Allocation

spur the economy; third, help the owners of single-family dwellings burdened by land taxes and now crushed by the mortgage interest rate which has now reached a record level.

Mr. Speaker, while the Liberal opposition recognizes that we have to assist owners, it deplores that the Progressive Conservative government has not made more original proposals. If we only take into account the mortgage interest rate set under this government, the benefits of such legislation are cancelled. I suggest that the government should tackle the cause of the problem instead of its effects. It should look for a scapegoat other than the previous administration since the Gallup poll showed clearly that the public is not satisfied with this excuse.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative government must understand that it will not buy the credibility it lacks with its tax credit program on mortgage interest. What is expected from it is much more a sense of responsibility and the capacity to govern the country in the best interests of all Canadians.

As to the second objective of this program, here is what Mr. Barry Gander, a construction expert, had to say about it in the December 1979 issue of *Construction* magazine, and I quote:

In fact, if the government is under the impression it has "taken care" of the construction sector problem with its tax credit program on mortgage interest, this impression will be shattered to pieces when it realizes that 75 per cent of the construction is non-housing construction.

And he added:

The lesson to be learned from the intentions announced by the government during the present parliamentary session is clear: aside from a few measures of regional impact, industry needs much more diversified policies than those which were announced up to now and we would like to be informed of those policies before rather than after some of our businesses go bankrupt.

You have only to refer to the government buildings construction programme, where most of the projects have been cancelled throughout the country. This programme would have met the needs of the construction industry. The government has not even given it the least thought as a means of putting the construction industry back on its feet. This is one of the numerous examples shown by the present government of its inability to take wise and non-partisan decisions which are not inspired by electoral considerations. Canadians have now realized they were fooled on May 22, and a measure such as Bill C-20 will not help them regain their confidence in a government which shows no leadership.

Economically, it relies on the private sector or on the provinces. The case of Alberta can probably be solved without too much difficulty. But as far as the Atlantic provinces, Quebec and the other provinces are concerned, we need more than pious wishes. To date, Mr. Speaker, what kind of agreement has this government concluded with the private sector to ensure the revival of our economy? How many Crown corporations were sold?

As to the third objective, namely, helping owners in difficulty, in its July 1979 report, the Toronto Real Estate Board