

Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): A number of other charges, too.

Mr. Sharp: Moreover, it is only when the bill gets into committee and at the report stage that amendments can be proposed and debated. The House will recall that because of the desire of various outside groups to make representations, there was unanimous agreement to refer Bill C-58 to the standing committee rather than to the committee of the whole House which is the usual route for bills relating to taxes. It was the universal desire of the House that this bill should get into committee where the various groups pro and con could make their representations.

Standing Orders 75A, 75B and 75C have been used infrequently—75C very sparingly indeed. I am inclined to think that in the future more use should be made of the principle of allocation of time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: Or, if I were to use a phrase which might commend itself more to members of the opposition, if we were to use the principle of management of time, which I think is useful to all parties of the House, I would think—

An hon. Member: You mean manipulation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp:—that something of this kind would be regarded with some favour. Moreover, I believe that the weight of debate should be shifted forward—I know this view is shared by many people in the House, including at least some of the House leaders—away from second reading, which tends to be repetitious and discursive, and toward the more focused debates which take place in committee, at report stage and on third reading.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (1510)

Mr. Sharp: It is my intention to bring proposals like this before the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization within a short time. Meanwhile, since we have to work with the instruments that are at our disposal, I feel the government is fully justified and the people would expect us to bring this issue to a vote at the present time so that the public can make its representations to members of this House and we can reach a decision on this very important bill.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly obvious that a government which cannot manage the economy certainly cannot manage this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: It is rather ironic that this motion for closure, or allocation of time, is brought under Standing Order 75C and the godfather of that rule now sits in this House occupied with other business, and the rule itself was imposed upon this House by closure. As the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) would say: It's a long, long lane that has no ash cans.

[Mr. Sharp.]

It is amazing for me to see hon. gentlemen opposite, those who formed the Liberal opposition of 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1963, sitting in this House now and behaving as they are, having seen the kind of organized resistance there was at that time. Not too many of them are here now. I think the hon. member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mr. Turner) was here, and I believe the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) was here in 1963. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) was probably behind the firing line, fashioning the bullets—most of them duds. In those days, the Liberal opposition facing the government under my friend the right hon. member for Prince Albert, took 65 days, 70 days, 75 days, 80 days, and a one time 88 days to consider supply: 88 days to put supply through this House because of the organized opposition and filibuster of the Liberal opposition of that time!

An hon. Member: Where is that government now?

Mr. Baldwin: Those practitioners of the open mouth have become advocates of the muzzle.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who does not fear the use of closure. I have always said in this House and outside that if members of the House, whether of the opposition parties or on the government side, took up time that should not be taken in a fruitless and useless filibuster, the government had a responsibility to intervene.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I have never argued otherwise. But they have to be very careful and sensitive with respect to the issue. Members of the House on all sides—I even include those silent members of the phalanx of the sphinx who sit over there saying nothing, breathing loudly and sometimes making speeches—when there is a case to be taken to the people of Canada, as we in this party felt there was after careful reflection of the principle involved in this bill, have the duty—not only the right, but the duty—particularly members of the opposition, to say that we will debate the measure to the extent necessary so that the people of Canada may be aware of what the government is trying to do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: Bill C-58 is not a long bill but it is rather intricate. It was not apparent to the people of Canada exactly what the government was trying to do. I see the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) shaking his head. He knows better. I only wish we had a freedom of information bill, because I would love to examine his files and see the letters that were sent to him opposing this measure. Hon. members on this side received a deluge of mail up to the time the measure was debated before the recess. We were doing what was our responsibility, laying the facts before the people on this issue.

The speeches have not been long. Yesterday there were nine speakers including the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). All in all, it was a short day. In my judgment, if the President of the Privy Council had restrained his impetuosity and stayed in line, this bill