

*Procedure and Organization*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I thank the hon. member for the argument he has submitted to the house. I suspect what he is now proposing to do to the motion is a nullity. My view of the matter is that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is interesting, but it is only theoretical at this moment.

The Chair does not rule by anticipation. It may be that the work of the committee will be terminated before the work of the current session. There is no indication how long the current session is going to last, either now or next year. Certainly the Chair cannot be asked to decide now what would happen if this committee did not terminate its work before the end of the current session, whenever that comes.

I think the suggestion made by the hon. member is not too helpful, although I do not think I should even rule on this. It is his motion and it is up to him to make the amendment if he wants the motion amended. If the hon. parliamentary secretary wishes to amend the motion in the way he suggests, it is up to him to do it, but I am rather suspicious he may not achieve the aim he thinks he will by making that motion.

Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Motion (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

#### MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

**Mr. Max Saltzman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, before one o'clock I had pointed out to the house the united stand of the opposition on this particular measure. I pointed out at that time that there must be a reason when an opposition unites. When people who have

actual differences with each other decide to take a common stand against a certain measure, which I might point out is most unusual in this house, there has to be a very obvious reason. It is because we all believe it to be wrong.

We believe the government is being incredibly stubborn and arrogant. For a long time there was a minority government. We thought perhaps the leopard would change its spots somewhat, but it is still the same old leopard.

● (2:50 p.m.)

The Liberals have a majority now and are determined to have everything their own way. They are requesting powers they do not need. The main point I should like to make in my intervention today is that the government do not need 75c. In addition I believe that 75c will come to haunt the government. They will find that by using 75c, although they may think they are protecting themselves, in the long run it will spotlight their own inadequacies, and remove them from a dialogue with this house and with the people of this country. With a dictatorial rule of that type there may be no need for them to understand. I am suggesting that in the long run it will be the government which will be hurt more than the opposition itself by 75c. Parliament will survive but the government will not.

There can be no question that we in the opposition have given a great deal. The opposition has given the government almost everything it has wanted. For a long time now our party has been asking for reform of parliament. We have made our position fairly clear. In many cases we have prodded the government into action. We are glad to see the rules which have been adopted. I know that many members of the Official Opposition have overcome their reluctance to grant the government certain powers. Private members with some reluctance have given up the power they had to push the government in order to get some of the necessary things for their ridings. They gave this up in the interest of making parliament more effective.

We have pointed out that we are prepared to accept 75A and 75B. Why then is 75c necessary? Surely it must be obvious that if we have 75c, 75A and 75B are a mockery. Who will negotiate and what kind of meaningful negotiations can take place when there is a gun held to one's head? This is all 75c is.

I would not think, particularly with the type of attitude displayed by the present