a single communication had gone to a single provincial government. This is what we mean when we say this government does not know how to conduct the business of parliament and the business of the country.

Then he goes on to say, "Over on the opposition side they filibuster. They stand in the way. They obstruct. Everything would be through if it were not for them". He ignores the fact that, as I said yesterday, the government rejected every opportunity but one to bring supply forward last autumn and they kept parliament from meeting until September 27. They have allowed only one supply day this session and we have had no request for interim supply even though the last interim supply was exhausted on February 1. Can they blame it on us if they managed their business that way?

So far as taking up time is concerned, the Prime Minister has made some very general accusations, in his normal way of making very general accusations, without supporting them with detailed evidence which will stand up under examination. Not the kind of evidence he brought forward the other day when he was quoting from a report of a statement which I made and from which he left out the word "not". I do not mean that kind of evidence; I mean evidence that will stand up under examination. Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what is the record of this parliament. It has already been stated this afternoon in a question addressed to the Prime Minister by my hon. friend to my left that a good deal of legislation has been passed. More legislation has been passed this session than was passed in the last session, when the government had 205 members. So that in itself does not bear out the accusation of complete obstruction. But who is doing the talking? Who are holding things up, if things are being held up? Who is responsible for exercising the time honoured right of members of parliament to discuss legislation and proposals before they go through? According to the Prime Minister the situation is, "Let us bring them in. Let us get them through. That is all that matters". He is so anxious to get things through this house that he will not even let us discuss $200 million of taxation imposed by order in council. He will not even bring that matter before the house. That is really carrying efficiency to the maximum.

But in so far as those matters which have been brought before the house are concerned, what has happened? With regard to the national economic development board, a very important piece of legislation, on November 27, 28 and 29 five Liberals spoke, three Progressive Conservatives, four Social Crediters —four out of a party of 30—and three New Democratic party members out of 19. On the Atlantic development board, a government measure which had the support of the government, which they now claim they wanted to get through at once and that we were holding it up, 17 Progressive Conservatives felt it necessary—and I do not criticize them —to talk in favour of a measure which they already supported and which they were not going to change. Twenty one Liberals spoke on that measure and put forward amendments to make it a better measure, and there were seven Social Crediters and 12 New Democratic party spokesmen. When that bill went into committee there were 49 Progressive Conservative members who spoke on it without proposing any changes whatever, but who rose to their feet to say, "This is a wonderful bill. Let us get it through, so 49 of us will make speeches on it". On second reading, Mr. Speaker, there were four Liberal, five Progressive Conservative, two Social Credit and three New Democratic party spokesmen; and on the last day, November 20, the Conservatives had to filibuster their own bill in committee for an hour and a half because there was no other business ready for the house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): That is not true.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fleming) was, I think, in Japan and was not aware of what was going on here.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I was in Japan when the house was in recess.

Mr. Pearson: He may have been telling the Japanese people there was no unemployment in Canada. Then we had a supply motion, the only supply motion brought forward last autumn. This government complains that they cannot get their estimates through, and they brought in one supply motion last autumn and introduced the estimates of one department of government—

Mr. Churchill: Six.

Mr. Pearson: They introduced the estimates of one department of government, the Department of Agriculture, for consideration. Most of the time in considering item No. 1 of those estimates was taken up by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton) filibustering his own estimates in order to explain what he really meant by something he said out west. It took him an hour or so to do it. Speaking on the supply motion on November 5 and November 6 the Conservatives spent two hours and three minutes, the Liberals