

Extension of Hours

the order of business of the House. That question was decided. The Hon. Member may not realize that. He may not accept it very readily, but I say to him that it was decided three and a half years ago.

The Hon. Member should stop living in the past. He should recognize the realities that are applicable today, June 1983, when we are here in the Chamber with a number of pieces of legislation before us that, if passed, would be of benefit to various sectors across the country, be they the farming community, the fishing community, people who are waiting for changes in the income tax legislation and other sectors that will be affected by various pieces of legislation. To facilitate the interests of those people, we would like to get on with the work of the House and do as much of it as possible before we shut the place down for the summer.

I was also intrigued by the words used by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain when he spoke about what the priority of concern ought to be, whether we ought to be concerned about, as he put it, the vacation plans of Members of Parliament. Well, I will be the first one to admit that I would like to spend a weekend or two with my family between now and September when we come back to this place again.

Mr. Benjamin: Why not resign then?

Mr. Simmons: I say to my good friend, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), that I would like to have some time to do some of the other work which I have been elected to do. Without being overly candid, I regard being here as a vacation. I regard this place as the place I come to get a little bit of rest. The real work, Mr. Speaker, is out there in the constituency. I want to get back there and be brought up to date on the concerns and views of the people who live in the 135 communities which I represent, communities stretched along 1,500 miles of coastline. I can only get to some of those communities by water or by air. Some of these communities mean a two and a half day trip. For that reason I cannot get to them on weekends. I have not been in some of them since last summer, and if I do not get to them this summer I will not have another opportunity until the summer of 1984. I have good reason to want this place to shut down so that I can go out and discharge some of my other responsibilities. It is useless, it is hopeless, it is hypocritical to come here and tell the House and the people of Canada what my constituents believe and stand for if I have not had the opportunity to touch base with them. I know what the people in Pettiforte, South East Bight, or Paradise—Paradise is in my riding, there is no doubt about that—

• (1640)

Mr. Blaikie: They need some comfort.

Mr. Simmons: There is Little Paradise and Great Paradise in my riding. That should come as no surprise to anyone in the Chamber. In speaking for them and the people of McCallum, François or Grey River, I want to be able to represent their up to date views. To do that I must hit the road pretty soon. I

have to hope that this place closes down so I can go back to my first love, the constituents who sent me here.

Mr. Benjamin: You have permission; go.

Mr. Simmons: My good friend, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain talks about stuffing the Crow Bill down people's throats. That is colourful, descriptive language, but it is not an awful misrepresentation of what happens in the House. Does he not understand or does he choose to misrepresent the process? That process admits that there will be legislation which all Members cannot necessarily support. No one has suggested that legislation must have the unanimous backing of every Member. This is an adversary forum and we are going to find ourselves on different sides of an issue, sometimes in the most vociferous fashion. There will be issues that I oppose and issues that I endorse, and that is the nature of this House. It is also the nature of the House that we have a way of settling scores, of settling issues, of dealing with business, and that is by taking votes. Before we come to the votes there is a well documented procedure in the Standing Orders which allows debate to take place in an orderly fashion.

The Standing Orders provide that in certain circumstances closure shall be introduced. At some point, in the wisdom of those who have the prerogative to introduce the motion, over the years it has been deemed by the House—which gives sanction to the Standing Orders—that under certain circumstances time allocation can be introduced. It has been introduced by this Government and it was introduced by the then Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) when he was Government House Leader in the fall of 1979. The rules provide for it.

If there are Members in the House who oppose measures, be it the Crow Bill or any other legislation, they have the same protection in the House as any other Member. I invite the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain in particular, and his colleagues in the New Democratic Party, to have the courage to play it by the rules. They need have no fear that their point of view will be trampled on. Indeed, if that view is not as well known across the country as it should be, that is because they have spent too much of the last month playing parliamentary games when they should have been articulating their position.

I know the position of the Liberal Party on the Crow issue and I know the position of the Tory Party on the Crow issue but I do not know the position of the NDP. That Party has failed the farmers of Canada in articulating that position. They have been too caught up playing delaying games. I recognize that the socialists, the NDP, may have good reason, and perhaps political reason, to look for a way to save their hide, to prevent the slide into oblivion.

Mr. Blaikie: You are not exactly on an all-time high yourself.

Mr. Simmons: They are batting on the wrong wicket if they are looking for a way to save their hides in western Canada. I implore them to stop using those scare tactics and to allow the Bill to go before the committee where it can be scrutinized on