

have been on his desk for a week, because we are concerned about renters, pensioners and people with no income.

The hon. member from Edmonton who spoke for the Tory party said that we on this side of the House have put forward no amendments. That too was a lie. It is completely untrue to say we have put forward no amendments, and the Minister of Finance knows it.

So what are we left with? I am sorry the President of the Privy Council is not here to listen to what I have to say, but we are left with a government which, I suggest, has caused its own problems. Were it not for the inflammatory speech which was made on second reading of Bill C-20 by the President of the Privy Council, we would not be in the position we are in now. He told us that it did not matter which amendments we put forward because the forms had already been printed and the government had no intention of listening to us. Were it not for that speech it would have been quite possible for us to go through second reading, which was coming to an end—and the President of the Privy Council knows it was coming to an end—and go into committee, where we could have dealt with the amendments, as we should have dealt with them, on their merits.

The government could have told us its position. If the government did not want to accept our amendments, we could have been told. But that is not what the government did. I am sorry about what the President of the Privy Council did because it was a major mistake, and he should not be surprised that he has suddenly inflamed the opposition. I would have thought that a member of the government who was so recently and for so long a member of the opposition—and who will shortly again be in the opposition—would have recognized the position in which we find ourselves.

In the best of faith we have put forward a series of amendments for the simple reason that we want to see a tax credit going to all Canadians regardless whether they own property and regardless whether they have mortgages. That has been our policy all along. That will be our policy through the debate. We told that to the minister at second reading, and it has been no secret. Unlike the Liberal party, which cannot decide whether it wants to give nothing or everything, we have decided we want to give everything, and we have made that position clear for a long period of time.

**An hon. Member:** How will you pay for it?

**Mr. Rae:** We have made it quite clear how we would pay for it. If you go through those tax expenditures you fellows released yesterday and which the Tory party released last week, there is ample room in taxes which are not being collected, more than enough to cover the necessary expenditure for a tax credit which is universal, and the government knows it.

The President of the Privy Council made an inflammatory speech in which he waved a red flag at us, saying that the forms had gone off anyway, the printing had gone ahead and there was nothing the government could do. That is precisely what we came to expect from the Liberal Party of Canada, the

### *Time Allocation*

tactic of closure, of shutting off debate, of having to get things through before Christmas and the creation of artificial schedules and artificial timetables which have nothing to do with the legal requirements and which have nothing to do with the law.

All of these things—

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was not in the chamber at the time but I understand that the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae) indicated that a statement I had made was not correct. I do not know whether he used the word “lie”, but everything but.

**An hon. Member:** He did.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Did he? He used the word “lie”, and I ask him to withdraw—

**Mr. Knowles:** The hon. member was not here.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Despite the chatterings of the oldest member of the Privy Council, or not the oldest, the youngest—

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** The most recent.

**Mr. Kilgour:** —I ask that that statement be withdrawn.

**Mr. Rae:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to look at *Hansard* tomorrow and raise this matter as a question of privilege, I will be glad to answer. I personally do not think I breached any privilege. I simply said that what he said was an untruth. He said we had not presented any amendments. I said that was a lie, and I will say that again.

**Mr. Kilgour:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known, even to the hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood, that “lie” is an unparliamentary word. I would ask for a ruling from Your Honour with respect to that and that the hon. member be permitted now to withdraw it on the basis that it is clearly unparliamentary language, a fact which is known to every member in this House, even members in the corner.

**Mr. Rae:** Mr. Speaker, the point of my submission today has been to suggest to the government—

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair should consider the point of order raised by the parliamentary secretary. I know that in the heat of passion generated by a raging debate of this kind sometimes we let our emotions get away with us, and we say things we should not.

● (1640)

Some years ago I myself had occasion to say that some statements made by the then prime minister were a lie, and I was compelled to withdraw it, which I did. I know that the hon. member feels very strongly about this. I admire and respect him as a very bright member with a future. He has some problem mathematically with regard to some of the issues which face this House, but I want to say honestly that Your Honour should give some consideration to the statement