

*Motion under S.O. 75C*

our unemployment? Surely hon. members realize what we have done by way of pricing ourselves out of the market. I know hon. members talk about the 900,000 unemployed. Have they also considered why people are not employed, why businesses are not expanding, why some businesses are even closing down? If one examines the Canadian economy, one will find that in many areas of economic activity we are pricing ourselves out of competition, not only in the markets of the United States but in the markets of many of our neighbours.

● (1630)

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) would like to see more and more money spent.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this debate is to determine precisely whether there should be a time limit imposed. I regret that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) used half his time discussing the merits of the changes to be made in the bill. In other words, half of his speech was totally irrelevant. The question is whether debate at this time should be limited.

The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) who spoke earlier this afternoon does not have a proper appreciation of the nature of this institution. Some members who have sat only in one place, and some for a relatively short time, have come to the conclusion that this is a legislative sausage-machine. I repeat that phrase and I repeated it the other day: this is not a legislative sausage-machine. This parliament is a forum for the exchange of ideas and comments. I have as much right to speak as the member opposite. He has as much right to be heard on behalf of his people as I have.

Some seem to think that the world of this parliament is concentrated in central Canada. They think that because a speech has been argued, and they are rarely well reported in the morning press that circulates in central Canada, that people in the further reaches of the country are as fully informed. I suggest that is totally wrong. We in Ottawa tend to become surrounded by this gilded cage, living in an artificial atmosphere. We think that because something has been seen over local television or in the local Ottawa papers, and perhaps in the *Globe and Mail*, the *Gazette*, *Le Devoir* or *La Presse*, it is known in the rest of the country. However, that is not so.

To say that extended debate on this side has not been effective indicates that the hon. member for Gloucester is fully unaware of the effects of the opposition to Bill C-70 of a few years ago, a thoroughly bad agricultural bill. The opposition that has been taking place with regard to western agriculture has been misplaced. Of the total country, these efforts saved the industry because the government, inept and trying to implement bureaucratically generated solutions, had little or no comprehension vis-a-vis this opposition. I could get into the nature of this bill. Certainly there are parts of the country where there are even stronger stands about periods of attach-

[Mr. Anderson.]

ment, longer ones than advocated in the bill. However, there are other parts of the country equally as important as some of the industrial constituencies in central Canada where it is felt it is wrong. Why should these people be steam-rolled? They have representatives who must stand up here and protest on their behalf. Therefore, this idea of 13 hours of debate being something that is beyond reason is wrong.

Let us not say, as some have said, that these things can be examined in committee, that people should attend committee in full strength. We have a minister for an hour and a half. Not everybody is there on time so that we can get started. There are 19 operating members on a committee. How much time does that allow? I recognize the right of participation by members on both sides in committee. If one member is entitled to ten minutes, another member is entitled to the same ten minutes. With the best of will and the best of intentions there can only be nine potential participants in discussion in a committee session. During the period of study of estimates a committee is most fortunate if it has a minister for three times during the period.

Let members on both sides of the House examine their own conscience. For the past two or three weeks both government and opposition attendance in committee has been down to about one-third of its strength. Those who attend get a far better performance out of it: there is much greater continuity in the questioning. The ones who attend are those who are really interested. I have participated in committee hearings where I was the only one who really questioned on behalf of the opposition. However, a proper theme may be established. We can get questions and reasonable discussion going with the minister or his senior officials.

This bears out my thesis submitted as recommendations for changes in the committee structure last summer. Our committees should be cut back in number. The membership of committees should be cut to about two-thirds of what it is now. We should have separate legislative committees. This House is now having problems of bills going to committees. I suggested to my colleagues that we ban legislation until the end of May, that we boycott all legislation until the end of May. Our job in committee at the present time is to study the estimates. This afternoon there are all sorts of people away. Tuesday morning, Tuesday afternoon, Tuesday evening—it is ridiculous to have this duplication. However, as is all too often the case, the least common denominator prevails. He who knows least about the rules, has the loudest voice in caucus, and does not want to make changes, insists on the other side there shall be absolutely Draconian cutting-back of speeches.

It should not be necessary to bring forward a motion of this type on the ground that it was brought forward at this time. Maybe this is to be some sort of a trial and the immigration bill and a few others will be dealt with in the same way. I say to the minister that even if this bill does get to committee, it is not going anywhere. Estimates are the priority until May 31.

**Mr. Cullen:** Threats!