

*Time Allocation*

move, but to paint it in other terms is to mislead the House and the public.

We recognize what is going on and we have said that we have an obligation to the public to bring in the six and five program across the board. That is part of the price we pay for being in Government. Sometimes we have to do things that are not particularly popular. If we are to get inflation under control, then certain Bills must be proceeded with. This one is part of the over-all six and five program. I do not expect the Opposition to allow any of the six and five Bills to go through without making us bring in time allocation—which is not closure. I anticipate that we will have to do that.

I think what you really have to decide before this motion comes to a vote, Mr. Speaker, is whether a reasonable time has elapsed for debate on this Bill. Any fair-minded person would conclude that it has and that we are now hearing arguments being repeated for the umpteenth time. This may not be particularly popular medicine, but I submit that it is leadership and it is responsible.

● (1600)

In addition to referring to this as closure, Hon. Members opposite have frequently talked about a decrease. When one caps an increase, that is not a decrease. I think the public are ill-served by that sort of political rhetoric. The motion before us today is reasonable and responsible. It shows that in fact the Government is giving leadership. We are not backing away from or shirking our responsibilities. Under all circumstances, and given the position of the Opposition, we are quite justified in the motion allocating the debate to one day for each of the two remaining stages.

**Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River):** Mr. Speaker, I found the address of the Hon. Liberal Member who just sat down very amusing. He does not agree that a rose by any other name is still a rose. If we follow his logic, instead of going out and buying roses to put on the table, we should go out and buy some stinkweed. Then he would tell us that it was not a stinkweed, that it was a rose.

**Mr. Smith:** A rose is a rose.

**Mr. Taylor:** He can call it whatever he likes, but it is still closure. He should not forget that he can call a rose a stinkweed but that does not make it a stinkweed, and vice versa. I would hate to have anybody call a stinkweed a rose and put it on my table. I do not like the smell of it, but I like the smell of a rose. I do not like the smell of closure, or whatever they call it. Closure is becoming the tyranny of the majority.

A few moments ago the Hon. Member was trying to justify this debate. As a matter of fact all Liberal Members are doing that. I would like to refer to the debate which we have had on this important issue affecting the incomes, the lives and health of thousands of people of the country. On November 18 we had debated it for just an evening, not a day. On November 25, which was a Thursday, we debated it right through the day. On November 30, which was a Tuesday, we debated it right through the day. Then, after two and a half days of

debating this important issue, the Liberals brought in closure on December 2, and it was a one-day closure at that. Then the Bill was called on December 10, debated one day and closed off. The Hon. Member said that there had been a long debate. If we counted it up, we would see that there has been three and a half days of debate, that is all. That is counting the day of closure. Surely that is not too long to debate a matter which is affecting the people who helped to build the country. We must not forget that. Then we came to report stage. On December 21 we had a full day. Then on Wednesday, December 22, we had just a short day.

I wish the Hon. Member would not leave. He should get these things straight in his mind before he goes out and tells the same type of stuff to other people. There were two days at report stage, and that is all. Now they are bringing in closure again. Do they say that two days is too long a debate at report stage? At report stage there were six Liberal, five NDP and nine Progressive Conservative speakers. That is 20 speakers altogether from the House of Commons which is comprised of 282 Members on an important issue affecting the lives of people who helped build the country. These are the people who made it possible for Hon. Members and me to sit here. The Hon. Member said that that was too much. I say that this is the tyranny of the majority.

When the Hon. Member from Quebec spoke a few moments ago, apparently he was fed up with the Government calling closure and wanted different rules adopted. We live in a democracy, not a totalitarian state. Although sometimes it is difficult to distinguish from the policies the present Government advances; it is still a democracy, and a democratic Government is supposed to reflect the thinking of the people, not tell the people what is good for them. This is not a totalitarian state wherein the Government knows all that is good for the people and tells them what is good for them. The Government should be listening to the people. If the Government would listen to them, it would not bring in this type of legislation in the first place. Also the Government should realize that while it is the Government of Canada, it has representation from far less than all of Canada. It has no representation in the three western Provinces. Surely the Government should be making a special stand in trying to find out what those Canadians think, but it does not want to listen to the representatives of those people. It wants to close us off and not listen at all. Then it claims it is a national Government.

The people of Canada do not want this type of legislation. They do not want closure advanced every time we have an important Bill. If there is debate on a Bill which goes on and on and the arguments become repetitive, that is one thing, but the arguments in this debate have not yet become repetitive. There are many things still to be said about our old age pensioners. That is exactly what the Bill is stopping. It is stopping us from telling what the people of the country want.

I wonder if Hon. Members opposite ever thought about going into a senior citizens' home where there are a hundred