

*Extension of Sittings*

That is what we heard on election day and the day following. What do we now find? We now find that those who are in the minority are saying that they want to debate the legislation, while at the same time they are doing all that they can to prevent the Government from tabling its legislation so that it can be debated.

That, Mr. Speaker, is arrogance. We do not need to be lectured by the Hon. Member for Saanich—Gulf Islands about arrogance, when all that we are trying to do is fulfil the mandate given to us by the Canadian people. That is all we are trying to do. Far from what the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria) has said, the motion that is before us today is to apply to one Bill only. It has a sunset clause. It will expire when this legislation is passed. It is not Draconian. It is not extreme. It is functional and designed to let the Government fulfil its mandate.

● (1430)

As I said before, repeating what others have said, the election is over. We are now here to work and fulfil the mandate the Canadian people have given to us.

I now want to draw on our experience of a few years ago in this Chamber and the work done by the committee headed by the former Hon. Member for St. John's East, James McGrath, now the Lieutenant-Governor of Newfoundland. It was commonly called the McGrath committee. I was a member of that committee, as was the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Transcona (Mr. Blaikie), at that time the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill, and the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) who sits next to me here. We did much to streamline the proceedings of this House to make it work better, create a better atmosphere, and give backbenchers a more precedent setting role. Members from all Parties agreed with the recommendations.

One of the memorable experiences we as a committee had was travelling to the United Kingdom and hearing witnesses from the House of Commons, the Mother of Parliaments, telling us their experience and how they proceeded with their work. I think all Members here realize that if ever politics were polarized, they are polarized in the United Kingdom.

It is a little like British Columbia that way. We have the Conservative Party on one side and the Labour Party on the other side, and the Leader of the Coalminers' Union is very prominent in the Labour Party. It is a polarized political scene and the practice is that each Party at election time publishes their manifesto. They

line up before the electorate all the things their Party believes in and would institute if elected to office. It is assumed that when that Party is elected it is going to fulfil its manifesto. On election night the public, having elected the majority Party, expect it to bring in legislation that will fulfil that manifesto.

When we on the committee met with officials of Parliament there, the clerks and their deputies, they told us of the practice that when the governing Party brings forward its legislation, it will meet with Leaders of the Opposition Parties. They call it "talking with the usual channels", who in our case would be the House Leaders of the various Parties. "The usual channels had their discussions," they say. There is a very important phrase they use constantly in those discussions and when they report back. They say: "The Government is entitled to its legislation". The Government has presented its manifesto to the people, the people have chosen that manifesto, and the Government is entitled to its legislation. That does not mean the Opposition is not entitled to debate it, raise its opposition, and bring forward amendments. Yet the understanding among the Parties is that it will not be unduly held up.

What is the experience in the U.K.? It does not matter how important the legislation, the debate lasts at most for a few days.

**Mr. Marchi:** Who rang the bells in 1980?

**Mr. Friesen:** I will come to the ringing of the bells.

**Mr. Marchi:** Did you charge the Chair as well?

**Mr. Friesen:** When the Hon. Member has something to say, he can stand on his feet and say it.

The debates in the U.K. usually last a few days and the legislation is passed because there is an understanding. The socialist party in England, being a little bit more mature than the two socialist parties here, understands that when democracy speaks the winners are the winners. They are entitled to pass their legislation. Our two socialist parties have not understood that yet. They are still in the adolescent stage when it comes to that kind of democracy.

One of the reasons the Parties here say we are not entitled to our legislation is that we had 43 per cent of the vote, and that is not a clear mandate. Let me point out, for example, that in 1972, we had a general election in the Province of British Columbia. The Hon. Member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca (Mr. Barrett), who sits