

If private enterprise and private investors, who know how to do these things properly, are to be expected to go in and develop the service areas, they have to have inducements of reasonable financial rewards and reasonable treatment.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

An hon. Member: Continue.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that the hon. member may continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Kindt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is high time the mountain parks were taken out of the hands of bumbling Ottawa bureaucracy and placed in the hands of someone, not a new wing of bureaucracy such as the proposed new leaseholds corporation which is a creature of the federal department based in the east, but someone who knows what the problem of park development is all about.

We have here and now a vivid example of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude by saying that I could go on to mention half a dozen other matters which I have on my list, all of which I feel are problems which should be solved by this government, not only in order to ensure that the work of the house would be carried out properly but also in order to get things going properly in the country.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin this afternoon by expressing my sympathy to the family of Margaret Konantz, a former member of this house, who died this afternoon. Although I did not sit in this house when Mrs. Konantz was a member, I have known her for many years through her work with UNICEF. I always admired her. On several occasions I had an opportunity to meet her at conventions of this party. As has been mentioned by another hon. member, she leaves a great legacy for Canadians.

I should also like to congratulate my colleagues of the backbench who moved and seconded the speech from the throne. I believe the speech given by the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Jamieson) was one of the greatest I have heard in this house in the year I have been here. He certainly makes it difficult for other backbenchers, including myself, who follow him.

In the speech from the throne which was given this week there was mention of parliamentary reform. It seems that many members of this house are interested in this subject

The Address—Mr. Allmand

because many of them have used it as the basis for their speech. As a matter of fact, this afternoon three speeches have been on the subject of parliamentary procedure. The speech from the throne in one part said:

Canada in embarking upon its second century of federal government, must provide its parliament with every facility to ensure that efficiency and thoroughness of deliberation, which, in the consideration of every item of public business, is alone the sure protection of the liberty and well-being of our people.

• (5:40 p.m.)

In his speech to the house yesterday the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) reiterated that wish and made more specific recommendations. This afternoon I should like to take the opportunity to support those statements and to make a few observations and recommendations of my own. Let me refer to some of the things that the novice member of parliament, immediately to reform our rules to put parliament, when observed in action from the floor or the galleries.

We often find it difficult to understand why there is so much irrelevancy and repetition, why the house often is empty, why it takes so long to introduce and pass a bill, why a small minority can obstruct the country's business, why the house cannot defeat a government bill without defeating the government and many other similar things. Many such things disturb observers of this house in action. After one hundred years of confederation the people of Canada are no longer satisfied with either the productivity or performance of parliament. They feel something must be done immediately to reform our rules to put parliament into the twentieth century.

In his speech yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) said that parliament is the embodiment of our liberties and freedoms, and therefore it cannot be efficient in the same way as a business or company is efficient. That is true, because parliament is a debating forum and a place where policy is discussed and ideas are exchanged, rather than a monolithic administrative process similar to a business or a company. As the Leader of the Opposition said, parliament cannot grind out legislation like a sausage producing machine.

Nevertheless this does not mean that our rules are as satisfactory or as efficient as they might be in order to promote the real purposes of parliament. Before we can really discuss reform of our parliamentary rules we must decide what are the real purposes of parliament, for it is only in knowing where