

Procedure and Organization

We have seen two retreats already in this debate. The first was made by the President of the Privy Council when he agreed to a debate on the report of the committee rather than on his motion. The second retreat occurred on Friday when the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman), the television specialist on filibusters, brought in an amendment to the motion moved by our house leader. It was obvious that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra had the sanction and support of the President of the Privy Council for his action, but it was not found acceptable to the Chair.

Since the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council move members up and down like a yo-yo on a string, it will be interesting to see which member the spider next entices into his web of intrigue to try to trap the opposition—in the words of the Prime Minister—into accepting that which to us is unacceptable.

I say to the President of the Privy Council: Withdraw 75c and bring on your legislation. Parliament and the official opposition have been prepared for months to deal with some of the major problems facing this country. However, it is the government that has been dilatory, ineffective and uncertain about the course that it wishes to follow.

Rule 75c would not do for the government what it suggests it would, even if its adoption were the desirable course to follow. It would not enable the government to bulldoze a large legislative program through this chamber. It would simply enable the government to cut off debate, at a time when it may be vitally necessary to continue debate so that the voice of the people, through their elected representatives, is heard on the matter.

I cannot help but wonder what the government is up to. Just what are those schemers in the cabinet planning? What secretive, cunning, destructive legislation is in the making that requires the type of control that is vested in 75c?

The record to date in this session indicates that this rule is definitely not required for the orderly conduct of the proceedings of this house. In all conscience I ask the government what in the name of heaven are they planning for the next session? What are the government planning for the future that they deem it necessary to have this type of club, this muzzle, this guillotine for silencing parliament? What important program has parliament delayed?

Every day we hear of increasing interest rates, increasing inflation and higher prices. In

what manner has parliament held up the government in its so-called fight against inflation? The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) has been asking for months about the commission on incomes and prices, and after almost a year the government finally got around to naming the personnel of the commission. And during all this time prices went higher and higher.

In what manner has parliament held up government action on the housing problem? We have plenty of land in Canada. There is all kinds of lumber, bricks, cement, stone, and lots of unemployed men who could usefully be occupied in putting these materials together to build homes. This being the case, why is there a housing shortage in Canada? Why was it necessary for a minister of the Crown to resign in disgust over the policies of the present government?

Surely the President of the Privy Council cannot accuse us of preventing him from bringing forward legislation to deal, for example, with the mounting torrent of water pollution in this country. The problem is national in scope and frightening in its over-all effect on the health and food supply of Canadians. Last year the federal Department of Fisheries opened a \$3.5 million salmon hatchery on the Saint John River, only to find that thousands of smolt have died in the hatchery this year owing to polluted river water.

In Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, man made pollution has destroyed thousands of tons of fish, as well as the income of hundreds of Canadians, and the federal government has still not embarked on a national water quality program. Such a program was promised by the right hon. Lester Pearson in 1967. This is now 1969 and still there is no leadership in this regard given by the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt the hon. member because I am afraid we will get into a pattern whereby hon. members are more inclined to discuss general problems in the country than the proposal that is before the house. I think it is an abuse of the rules of the house if members take half of the 40 minutes that is reserved to them, perhaps even longer, to discuss the aspects of all of the 18 or 20 departments of government. I suggest to hon. members that what they are discussing at the present time is essentially the motion before the house and the amendment thereto. The Acting Speaker reminded