

*Adjournment Motion*

make it a significant and important debate. As the Hon. Member mentioned, Members travel on Monday and Friday.

The Committee realizes that this may not in fact be working. The House will have the opportunity to look at this in December. It may want to change that rule. I hope all Members will very carefully think through the importance of this. Some of the changes that have been made are very good. Some of the things we may wish to change, such as having Private Members' hour on another day. I have no objection to that as long as we accomplish what we set out to do, namely, raise the profile of the backbench Member.

**Mr. Harquail:** Mr. Speaker, since this began I have observed that there is a considerable decrease in attendance in mid-week. With the location of the nation's capital here, people go to Montreal or Toronto. They come back for a day or two.

**Mr. Benjamin:** That is not the whole country.

**Mr. Harquail:** No, but it involves a significant number of Members. The Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton talked about trying to bring importance back to the House. We are all very much interested in that. However, it seems to be counter-productive to have Private Members' business on Wednesday afternoon. Has the Hon. Member any further comments on that?

**Mr. Cooper:** Once again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member's comments. I am reminded by the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton that the Committee is prepared to look at that matter. In fact, it is encouraging Members who have a concern to address it to the Committee. They would like to know about the various problems and difficulties and some of the purely logistical questions regarding timing. That is important. What we want to accomplish is an authoritative report. We would like to raise the profile of the individual backbencher. That is what is important, not whether it be on Wednesday or a Friday. The Hon. Member's question is legitimate. I am certain the Members of the Committee will have no trouble considering it.

● (1650)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Criminal Code—Pornography—inquiry respecting ministerial action—Introduction of legislation—Definition

of obscenity; the Hon. Member for Cariboo-Chilcotin (Mr. Greenaway)—Income Tax—Auditing of farmers' income—Interpretation of law—Stand taken by farmers—Minister's position—Disallowances of wife's labour; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie)—Veterans Affairs—Review of War Veterans Allowance Act.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—PARLIAMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Nielsen:

That this House condemns the Government for its deliberate and persistent undermining of the parliamentary process, for its flouting of parliamentary traditions and for its continuing attempts to reduce Parliament and parliamentary government to an irrelevant appendix in the formulation and application of major national policy decisions and the expenditure of public funds, and demands that the Government immediately reverse its attitude of regarding Parliament as the private preserve of the Liberal Party thus hastening the restoration of respect for and the dignity of this institution.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** The Chair will recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council (Mr. Smith) and thereafter the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

**Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to participate in this debate. It gives me the opportunity to discuss the atmosphere and climate in the House. I am a relatively junior Member of the House but I enjoy spending time here trying to learn the rules and get a feel for the House. Unfortunately I cannot say that all Hon. Members have the same interest in the House, but many who do are present today.

The motion is in the name of the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) who still has one week to go before the gong rings on his current role. This gave him an opportunity to play the role of the parliamentarian, perhaps even the role of statesman. I regret that he missed that opportunity. I think he injected into this debate a tone that was not very healthy. He huffed and puffed and, in my view, misled the House in the way of a brawler, rather than a parliamentarian. I think the level of debate picked up the moment he sat down.

I thought the contribution made to the debate by the Hon. Member for Hamilton (Mr. Deans) was worth-while. The Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) also made a worth-while contribution. I enjoyed the remarks of the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper). I thought my friend, the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) made a contribution, as did my great friend, the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker).