

*Procedure and Organization*

demonstrate the new politics, a new direction, or even to show a glimpse of progress toward a solution of the many problems facing many Canadians today?

Oh, sure, interest rates have been upped through three farm bills, a couple of fisheries bills, and on student loans. In the classic manner of fighting inflation by allowing higher interest rates for the lenders and higher taxes for the borrowers, the government has freed mortgage housing rates to find their own level somewhere in the stratosphere. Concurrently the 3 per cent income tax surcharge has been maintained. Additionally, the magnificent gesture of the added 2 per cent social development tax levied upon wage earners was sanctioned in the name of protecting them from themselves.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must direct his attention to the fact that we are debating a question of procedure and I would invite him to return to the subject matter which really is before the house.

**Mr. Rose:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was attempting to show an example of how we might be using our time here debating something of greater relevance at the moment than 75c. You have said I have strayed too far afield, and I will be guided by your wisdom. I shall try to get back on the track and proceed.

I would suggest that the debate in which we are currently involved has a number of ramifications which have to do with the future of Canada and it has been used as a substitute for the real issues that face the Canadian people. What we are engaged in here is not debate which most people understand but rather a debate in which all the relevant things which concern the people of Canada are deliberately avoided. We are engaged in what to most people is an almost incomprehensible struggle, long after we have completed all the regular government legislation, all the legislation with which we have been asked to deal.

Here we are burning the midsummer oil, so to speak, when most members would prefer to be in their constituencies doing the other kind of work a member of parliament is required to do. While we are here in the house discussing 75c we of course cannot be in our constituencies dealing with the kind of problems which crop up from time to time and which need our attention.

As I say we are burning the midsummer oil because this whole thing has been motivated

by a stubborn cabinet determined to save the face of the house leader in respect of what I believe to be a rather dumb move and a heavy-handed attempt to stifle debate on some future legislation of which we know nothing at this time. I am certain many members on the other side of the house share the desire many of us have to adjourn and return to our constituencies. But here we are locked in combat. We will remain here until sanity returns or weariness erodes our will to prolong the battle.

I am sure Canadians would have full confidence in what we are doing here and would grant full support to it if we could demonstrate that this struggle is in the interest of progress, but it is not. We are staying here not to solve the desperate income gap between the rich and the poor in Canada. We are here not to bring in legislation to assist the veterans and the pensioners with a solution to their problems. We are here not to quieten the turbulence of and provide social justice to the native people. We are here not to enact legislation to brighten the employment picture for university students and those just graduating from high school. We are here not to protect our industry and financial institutions from foreign takeovers. Finally we are here not to enact laws to preserve our environment from industrial pollution. In fact we are probably contributing to the air pollution in this chamber at this very moment.

On the contrary we are adding greatly to the costs borne by the long suffering Canadian public because of a naked, unsophisticated power grab by an overwhelming government majority in an arrogant attempt to achieve unilateral control which the government does not need. What is embarrassing for the government is that they have no real issue here. Their problem, even in disciplining their own silent and long suffering backbenchers, is that they cannot point to one example this session in which the people's business has been frustrated by an intractable, irresponsible opposition.

What frightens me, Mr. Speaker, is the reason they want this power. Why do they need it? As the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) said, why do they need the legislative over-kill? What really disturbs me, as it must disturb members on both sides of the house, is that the gag rule will have just as much effect on, and will muzzle members on the other side of the house when they next journey to sit on this side of the house. I know that like Hitler's