• (1520)

More and more the people of Canada are realizing that this is a measure that gives a bonanza to a privileged few. When something is done for a privileged few, it means that the whole mass of the Canadian people must pay for it. There is sense in the general rules of this House that require us to take a bit of time to put important measures through. As the President of the Privy Council knows when matters are not of an important nature we will co-operate. He knows that we met last week and agreed that we would try to get a certain number of measures through by last Monday, and that we got through more measures than he had asked for or expected.

When legislation does not require that time be taken, we co-operate and put it through. But here is a serious measure in so far as its charge on the public treasury is concerned. Canadians are just beginning to understand and realize that it is a fraud and that it should not be put through. Why is the government so anxious to go through with this proposition, to the extent that it has even printed the income tax forms? It wants to be in a position, in case there is an election in the spring, to go to its Rosedale type constituents across the country and say, "See, we delivered, we made the people of Canada pay through the nose for the bonanza we are giving to a certain privileged few".

The government is defying all the traditions and the rules by printing the income tax forms, using closure and muzzling Parliament in the way that it is this afternoon. I suggest that this is no way to treat the House of Commons. My friend, the President of the Privy Council, has said these very things in the past about the use of closure. After all, that is what it is; it closes off debate.

When the Liberals were on the other side they would try to tell us that it was not closure, but they have changed their view now that they are on the constructive side of the House. When the Tories were on this side they called it closure, but now they try to tell us that it is just an allocation of time. Call it what you will, it cuts off debate right at the important Committee of the Whole stage.

The hon. member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mr. Rae) courteously, and with the approval of this caucus, submitted to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie), when we went into Committee of the Whole, the list of the amendments that we were proposing. In other words, the government knows what we would like to do to improve the bill, even though we have been told that the forms have been printed and there is not much chance. We are prepared to give the matter the consideration that it deserves, but do we get any positive response for our efforts? The response we get is the use of this Draconian measure, this treachery, this double-treachery, this triple-treachery—those are not my words, they are the words of my friend and neighbour, the President of the Privy Council.

The government House leader tries to tell us that this is a less severe measure than the closure rule C. D. Howe implemented. All C. D. Howe was doing was using the very severe closure rule that was first brought into Parliament many years ago by Sir Robert Borden, another Conservative. Please

Time Allocation

remember, Mr. Speaker, that in that case the Conservatives of the day were having trouble getting a certain bill through, so the Borden government stopped debate on that measure, brought in a proposal to change the rules in the form of that severe measure, closure, and then took up that naval aid bill and went ahead with the closure rule.

My friends across the way are reverting to type. They have produced a paper on parliamentary reform and they try to talk about open government, about giving more attention to the views of the members of Parliament in all parties of the House. They talk about committees. The government is affronting Parliament every time it turns around.

They complained today about time being taken on privilege. I suggest that there has not been in this session of Parliament a more legitimate and worth-while question of privilege than the one raised today by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom). It is significant that we dealt with that question of privilege on the same day we are dealing with a government that is snubbing Parliament and muzzling it in this way. This is just as wrong as every attempt in the past to close off debate. It is even more deleterious to the operation of this House.

As I say, the amounts of money involved are tremendous and the unfairness of this legislation to pensioners, renters, people who do not pay income tax and the great masses of the Canadian population which will have to put up the money for this bonanza, is such that this Parliament should be given the time to discuss this bill in full. My colleagues and I will vote as strongly as we can against this Draconian measure which makes this a black day for Parliament and a black day for Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a nice change to hear an NDP member worrying about the money that will be spent. The hon, gentleman who just sat down is the biggest spender in the House. He would like to spend money on everything, but he does not want to spend money to help the working class or middle class home owners of Canada.

The hon. member says that this legislation is a special piece of discrimination. What is the legislation which we pass all the time if it is not for particular groups? We passed some legislation the other day providing aid to spouses under the spouse's allowance. That legislation was for a particular group of people. Is it to be suggested that we should give the baby bonus and family allowance to every Canadian because it discriminates against adults? What a lot of trash and nonsense we have heard from the hon. gentleman opposite.

What about the veterans allowance? Is that not for a particular group of people?

Mr. Knowles: Who deserve it!

Mr. Crosbie: But when it comes to the lower middle class, the middle class, the home owners, the people who are paying