

Supply

only consistency in this business is its inconsistency and uncertainty. That is number one.

As my hon. friend from Nepean-Carleton said earlier with respect to Parliament, you can pervert or prostitute any rule of procedure of any institution, especially the House of Commons, unless there is some good will and tolerance and unless there is respect for each side and its arguments, even though you violently oppose their position. What has happened in this institution is that instead of good will, we have rancour; instead of tolerance, we have arrogance; instead of trust, we have suspicion. It is a combination of all those things which caused the bells to ring for 16 days. It was not just the energy security bill. I did not understand the details of it when the bells began to ring. I can tell you, as can most of the public, I now know substantially more about the energy security bill than I did on Tuesday, March 2.

There must be the respect, tolerance and good will flowing back and forth in this institution, but it is not possible when the leader of our country says that we are a bunch of nobodies because that means by inference that the people are nobodies. That cannot help the institution.

There is a fundamental reform needed in the House of Commons with respect to prime ministers, not this particular Prime Minister but any Prime Minister. I agree with the paper put forward by my hon. friend from Nepean-Carleton, the former president of the Privy Council. I have also heard some other useful ideas today. The leader of the NDP, the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), made a suggestion which I frankly feel has a lot of merit. That is that the House meet for three weeks and members spend the fourth week in their ridings, which would be complimentary to their constituency office.

With respect to the mechanics of the House, I am in agreement with the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. In terms of perks, in terms of staff and in terms of the salary, I am much better off than I was when I came to this institution in 1965 because, unlike him, I shared an office with another member. If a secretary came in the office, one member would have to leave because there was not enough space in that small office. The parliamentary secretary is absolutely right that there has been a tremendous transformation in the mechanics of the House of Commons.

However, there exists a fundamental paradox. Through the increase of perks and technology, we have the ability to communicate, yet I do not think we are being heard, because of this institution, as well as we were heard when we did not have some of the technology, including telephones. We go through the form and we have more paper flowing across our desks. Perhaps we are closer to being nobodies than we were in the mid-sixties when I first came to this place.

You can have all the reforms you want. You can have committees with powers to investigate the matter of the *Ocean Ranger*, but, as the hon. member for Gloucester, chairman of the transportation committee, said earlier, it is an insult to me as a Canadian to have to listen to the national news about the *Ocean Ranger* to discover what happened to Canadian lives in

Canadian waters through an American congressional committee when the Canadian committee could not hear that evidence.

My time is almost up but I would like to say that my fundamental premise for reform is that the right of the Prime Minister to dissolve Parliament must be restricted. I believe that this was said earlier by the hon. member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) when he was discussing block voting. Unless we are prepared to face the fundamental issue that we only have a vote of confidence for the defeat of the government on a Speech from the Throne, a budget or a tax bill, then we are just toying with the issue. As members we should vote on a bill to determine if it can receive a majority of support in the House. If it cannot, the very next question which should be put by the Chair without debate is, the bill having been lost, does the government have the confidence of the House. In most cases there would not be a vote against the government, it would only be against a particular bill, thereby directing the minister who introduced that bill to redraft it.

Without going any further, I would just say that it is crazy to give me a salary, which is becoming more reasonable, and all the benefits of my office while having me, along with 281 other members, play the same game and in effect vote the same way as was done in the days of John A. Macdonald. The bell is tolling for us, and unless we address our problems and at least organize the procedure and organization committee, this place will be even more ludicrous than perhaps it is now.

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to indicate to the hon. member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) that the chairman of the transport committee is the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) who represents a constituency neighbouring on mine.

I do not want to comment too much this evening about the events of the last 16 days since I would like to make some other points. I would only say that it has been a regrettable period. Basically, I support the position taken by the government House leader, which was to maintain the tradition that the majority in the House of Commons has the duty, responsibility and power to determine the orders of the day and to decide upon the form in which legislation is to be presented in the House of Commons subject to the ruling of the Chair as to its acceptability and its form.

That tradition is basic and must remain that way, otherwise I do not see how any democratic assembly can work. Filibusters have taken place before, and I suppose this form of filibuster which we have seen, because it was different and new, has dramatized a filibuster tactic much more. I think that we have underestimated the extent to which this institution functions on mood and human feelings. Although filibusters will occur in various forms, I repeat that I deplore the sort of filibuster we have just had because it prevented us from coming to the House of Commons to answer or ask questions and debate. However, in a country as diverse and complex as Canada where people have referred to it as a human experience—certainly a political experience—it is understandable