

Allotment of Time for Bill C-11

seven years. They are going to get back roughly half of what they spend, according to the minister's reply. The program will cost the government \$1.4 billion over seven years. The Minister of Finance says if he makes the grants non-taxable, he will lose \$560 million. He has to get \$560 million back from the \$1.4 billion that the other minister intends to spend over seven years.

If the maximum grant is \$350, you will need four million householders outside Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island receiving the grant. If you divide \$350 into \$1.4 billion, it goes four million times, so you would have four million householders getting the maximum grant of \$350. Every one of those four million householders will have to be in the highest tax bracket, or at least the 50 per cent tax bracket, because they will have to lose half of what they get to make up the \$560 million.

What the minister is saying is that there are four million householders who are going to get the maximum grant and who are all going to be in the 50 per cent tax bracket, because that is the only way he could lose \$560 million if he made these grants non-taxable. It is quite obvious he is not accurate; he is not even approaching accuracy. To suggest that one-half of the cost of the program would come back in taxes if the grants remain taxable in the eight provinces is not true; it is not the fact. But that is the kind of answer we have been getting from the Minister of Finance over the last few days.

By the way, there are only 7,026,000 householders in the eight provinces, so you would require a fantastic acceptance rate. You would require four million out of those 7,026,000 householders to take the grant. To make it even more ridiculous, only 1,223,000 are eligible the first year, and it gradually goes up year by year; so you haven't got four million even eligible until four years have gone by. Never before has such codswallop been put before the House. Codswallop is something which is scraped off the floor after the cod has been dealt with pretty sternly. Thus, the minister will know what I think of his answer. When we stand up to ask questions in this chamber, this is the type of answer we receive.

● (1642)

The committee of the whole is the only effective committee parliament has. We can ask questions, and if the minister does not give proper answers we can ask another question. It is unlike House committees. House committees are emasculated. House committees are parliamentary eunuchs guarding the harem of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), where he hides his delights. The hidden delights of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are protected by the Parliamentary eunuchs, the committees of the House of Commons. Those committees have no power. They cannot subpoena anything. They are dominated by the majority; the majority controls them. The chairmen are Liberals for the most part. They are under the thumbs of the powerful ministers in the government, as well as the Prime Minister. One cannot expect the chairmen to be independent.

[Mr. Crosbie.]

Members can only do what they are permitted to do. They sit in committee. They are given ten minutes to ask questions and receive answers. A member asks a question and he receives a non-answer from some long-winded minister for nine minutes. It is the most pusillanimous and piffling procedure ever foisted on parliament.

Mr. Boulanger: That is not so.

Mr. Crosbie: The hon. gentleman opposite is too used to being a Liberal backbencher. Members on this side of the House have not been through that experience. We are full of vim, vigour and vitality. We ask questions and we want answers. We are not interested in the parliamentary eunuchism that this government enforces on members opposite and on Canadians. We want vibrant committees which have power.

Mr. Boulanger: That is good for TV.

Mr. Crosbie: We do not want these emasculated committees. We do not appreciate closure. We are like the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner). He does not appreciate the Cape Breton miner. He infers that they are lazy louts who do not want to work.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: We do not appreciate closure. Positively, we do not appreciate it. Also, we do not appreciate the honourable baa-baa black sheep opposite.

Mr. Boulanger: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: If the hon. member opposite wants to rise and speak on this motion, he can do so.

Mr. Boulanger: I will. You are a phony.

Mr. Crosbie: I am sure there are people who would like to hear what he has to say. Wherever these people are located, they would like to know why he is voting to cut off debate in this House on the income tax amendments which are before us. The only effective forum to put a minister on the griddle and give him a bit of a frying is committee of the whole. That gives him a bit of a frying, but not a scorching.

The hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald) would not have had closure brought in. He was fearless in his approach. He was convinced, absolutely, that he was right. He had all the wrong ideas to back that up, but he was not afraid to put them forth for examination. The new minister is somewhat different. The new minister is a slippery eel; he will slither this bill through the House, using closure. He will seduce the senatorial promises, the sleek and sumptuous growth of wealth and corporate privilege.

That is similar to what may be said by members of the New Democratic Party. The minister will rush this through because he is receiving telephone calls from the investment community. The poor fellows do not know what to do. They do not know what to expect. They cannot add two and two. Apparently they do not realize that 145, or whatever the figure is, is more than