

Time Allocation

the British parliamentary system, you find that they too have gone to some form or another of automatic closure.

I would argue that the failure of this House for a number of reasons to introduce automatic closure is the major reason why this institution is rapidly becoming less relevant in the important debates that we have today and will face in the future. The irony of that situation is that the people who, publicly or rhetorically, express their love and respect for this House are the very people who object to closure, the one instrument that will save this House from the doom that I and many other people see ahead of us in the near future. I cannot understand that. How can we have a gentleman like the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker)—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am trying to digest an extraordinary comment made by the speaker who was just now on his feet.

• (1630)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilgour): I do not consider that a point of order. I recognize the Hon. Member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Kelly).

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Hon. gentleman's inability to digest the facts—I am not appealing to his stomach, I am trying to appeal to his head—the point I was making is that I listen very carefully and I respect very much the views of the esteemed Hon. Members of this House such as the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton, and it strikes me as being highly ironic that that Hon. Member, and people like him, who love this institution and want to do the very best for it, would be among the very first to stand up in this House to object to the only procedure which, frankly, is going to rescue this institution from the oblivion to which it is so resolutely headed. I do not understand the contradiction between the conviction of his heart and what I hear him say from time to time in the debates in this House.

There are some Members of this House who might say, "Well, I can accept the need for closure, time allocation of one sort or another in the deliberations of this House, but the real question is, should there be closure on time allocation placed on this Bill today?" I would respond, Mr. Speaker, by saying, yes, I think there should be closure today. I know there are Members of the Opposition Parties who say there should not be closure because the argument is not over, and they want to continue the argument through this week or next week or next month, or whatever, until the issue is resolved. I would like to make an important distinction which I think should be understood in the debates in this House. You do not debate issues until the argument is over. You do not debate an issue in this House until all the facts are in.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Who decides that?

Mr. Kelly: I know, as everyone knows, that arguments of this sort produced by Bills as sensitive and as important as this one will never end. You will never get anyone in this House to believe that the argument is over, and because that will never happen I think there has to be a point in the life of a debate

where the question can be raised and reasonably answered, "Are the facts in?" I believe the answer to that is, yes, the facts are in.

Although I have not participated in this debate until now, I have been following it through *Hansard*, and I find nothing new in the debate over the last few weeks from what I saw in the debate over the first few weeks. I believe that is as good a test as any to see if the facts are in. Is there anyone on the Opposition side, or on this side for that matter, who is raising any new points or introducing any new facts or looking at the issue from a fresh perspective? The answer is, no, there is not.

The Hon. Members opposite are not without imagination. They are not without research staff. I think, frankly, from what I have read in *Hansard* in the last few days, they have exhausted both. Because of that, I think it is legitimate for this Government to ask for a vote on time allocation today.

The third point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, centres on the whole controversy over income limitations. Should there be income limitations in today's economy? My answer to that is, yes. Several months ago, in a debate in the House, I argued that income limitations should be of the strictest kind. I suggested a wage freeze, that no one should get any increases of any sort. That fell on deaf ears in this House and in Cabinet, but I do not think it was without merit. Notwithstanding, whether it is zero per cent, 2 per cent or 6 per cent, the real issue is, should there be income limitation? I believe the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is, there should be.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Start with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Mr. Kelly: A study published a number of years ago, quickly forgotten and immediately buried, indicated that about 60 per cent of the price increases in Canada was generated domestically, that is, 40 per cent of the price increases was generated abroad. Given those conditions, and given an inflation rate of 10 per cent, I feel it is legitimate for this Government, in those areas of jurisdiction under its control, to place an income ceiling or capping of 6 per cent, because that 6 per cent ceiling reflects the domestic rate of inflation. Frankly, I do not believe anyone in this country, senior citizen, Member of Parliament, or anyone else, should expect an income increase to compensate totally for the increase in inflation. For all of us to expect that is to keep the inflationary spiral going, and the irony of that is that all of us want two things at the same time: we want to break the inflationary spiral and we want to keep up with the price increases. We cannot do both, Mr. Speaker. We can do one or the other, but we cannot do both. If it is important for our short-term and long-term interests to control inflation, then I feel we have to accept the argument and accept the reality that no one in this society should be receiving an income increase in any one year higher than 60 per cent of the inflation rate of that particular year. That is why I do not believe that the 6 per cent increase which we have placed on the pensions of civil servants is either arbitrary or unfair.

Mr. Orlikow: Would the Hon. Member permit a question?