

Business of the House

that covers all the sections of the new tax bill. They knew what they were doing and they did it for exactly the same reason they have done everything else. There is some sugar in the clauses, there is some pepper and bitterness in the clauses, and they intend to make members of the opposition vote either for the sugar or for the pepper in a bill deliberately designed to confuse and make it impossible for an intelligent discussion or an intelligent vote to be taken on every part of the tax law, which is what we should have had.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that most of the difficulty as to time has arisen out of that shameful, stupid or deliberately arrogant way of presenting the bill, because we have not been able to deal with a clause or two and then go on to something else. I want to make it clear that we will vote against the motion and we will vote against the bill. I want to make it clear also that our opposition is not that of the Progressive Conservative party. We are not here to protect the corporations and the difficulties they will have. We are here to protest the way in which the government, through the bill, is twisting the economy and threatening our future by the concessions it makes to the corporations.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it was unnecessary for the government to take this step and that it is impossible for anyone who has any concern for Parliament or democracy to vote for this motion.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for a new member of the House to join the distinguished company that has already participated in this debate.

Mr. Woolliams: That won't put you in the same package.

Mr. Jerome: I notice that the first one to holler is the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) who is distinguished, of course, for the piece of the action he got while his side was in government. That is why he is so happy now.

Mr. Stanfield: I think there is some hurting over there today.

Mr. Jerome: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the trepidation I feel in entering the debate is made the more obvious because of the last interjection from the other side. It is trepidation not because of the opposition but because of the quality of the contributions I have to follow from this side of the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: You won't have to be very good.

Mr. Jerome: I should like to point out two things. First, the approximately 100 members of this House who, like myself, were newly elected in this Parliament learned very quickly that the veterans of this Parliament seemed to feel that somehow they had a monopoly or patent on the formula for parliamentary democracy and that their

understanding of it in the endless days of debate and filibuster was the kind of understanding and appreciation and pride in our parliamentary institutions that was shared throughout the country.

If I have no other task this afternoon except to destroy that myth, Mr. Speaker, it will be my pleasure to do so because I want to say that particularly among the young people of this country it is indeed a myth. What should be a sense of pride in this institution, in its efficiency, in its work and in its decisions is more often, pitifully, a sense of disgust at the procrastination, the filibustering, the needless delay in this Parliament in getting anything done.

An hon. Member: There is a Fascist speech!

Mr. Jerome: The point is, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a matter of any pride among the people of this country to know that we are the last of the Parliaments to embrace something that should have been done some time ago, something that has been embraced in every other country in the world, some kind of intelligent system for programming, not after the fact as is the rule with closure but programming in advance as is the case with the time allocation rule for debating time in this House and the calendarization of the parliamentary year.

Mr. Speaker, public demands and the precedents of other Parliaments led us to this point where, after much battle, we introduced and implemented a time allocation rule. I say to those who have continually used the word "closure" that it is surprising that they want to rush to that term when they know it is false and does not apply to this rule. Most of the time they rush to the public and the media. They pride themselves on the precision of their language, on their integrity and honesty in this chamber, but they know when they call this closure that they are being dishonest because that is not what it is.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jerome: It was out of that spirit, out of the desire for some intelligent programming of the business of this House that is evident in every other Parliament of the world, that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization met at the beginning of this Parliament. In this spirit of tremendous co-operation, which was an example to me as a new member, the House leaders of all parties achieved a number of very beneficial rule changes not the least of which were rules 75A, 75B and 75C.

It is no news that rule 75A which provides for time allocation in the event of unanimous agreement amongst House leaders added little to the procedures of the House because basically things have been that way. We all know that when all are agreed this House can set time limits as it wishes.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Standing Order 75C was really the departure from previous practice and a step into the future in line with what other Parliaments have done in that it provided some machinery whereby time allocation could be proposed and voted upon by the House in cases where the House leaders were not in agreement. All members of that com-