An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Whicher: They often sit there until two or three o'clock in the morning until they are worn out and glad to let any bill go through.

Mr. Hees: Answer the question.

Mr. Whicher: I have told you I do not know everything about all the legislatures here in Canada. I have not done my research, as no doubt the hon. member has, into what is exactly taking place, but I say that the Tories in Ontario really push things through. That is how the Tories do it in Ontario.

An hon. Member: Because it is good legislation.

Mr. Whicher: The first question had to do with the omnibus bill.

Mr. Nowlan: We are not so much concerned with talking about 75A and 75B as we are with talking about 75c.

Mr. Whicher: The point is that there are going to be many other bills coming before the House of Commons. I cannot accept the proposition that the Omnibus Bill could have been handled by the three parties. We never know how you people are going to react. How can half of you in the house vote one way in favour of a measure, and the other half vote against it?

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I rose to ask a question of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings before he sat down. I should like to ask him that question now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member would require unanimous consent.

Mr. Hees: Let him ask the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Gibson: I was very interested in the hon. member's proposition relating to the United States Congress and the fact that some being of Canadians, including the housing of the speeches there are filed. The hon. member suggested that speeches here might be filed as they are in the United States. Does the hon. member suggest that these be print- and the fishing industry. Since I have a speed in a separate section of Hansard, or would cial interest in those measures I looked forhe simply have these filed in the regular ward to reviewing the provisions of this legisway? If they were filed in the regular way lation and hoped to suggest some improvewould this not lead to a complete ruination of ments to the minister when it was brought parliament, everybody simply filing their forward.

Procedure and Organization speeches? Would that not make a complete mockery of the whole process?

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, this does not make a mockery of the legislative system in the United States. As I said in the first place, nobody, but nobody, and you know it, pays attention to these regularly read speeches which just bore everybody in the house. If the house does not hear a speech anyway there would be no loss, and there would be a gain because we would save time. Let us file some of our speeches as representing the views presented by an hon. member of parliament. A member would bring them in and present them to the Clerk of the House. They could then be put in Hansard as though they had been spoken here. Nobody would interject, nobody would find fault, nobody would ask questions. In this way they could be recorded in Hansard and sent home to his constituents, and we would save a great deal of time and a great deal of boredom.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, it was not my original intention to speak on the measure presently before this house. In fact the record will show that I did not participate in the rules debate last December. Other members of the Official Opposition participated in the deliberations preceding the tabling of the special committee report. They spoke ably and well on behalf of my party, and it was not necessary therefore for me to participate at that time.

You will recall that during that debate the government showed at least a measure of reasonableness. The bulk of the report was acceptable and good. We in the opposition objected forcefully to the infamous 16A and its restrictions on our rights. It was this objection which eventually caused the government to reconsider its position and decide that 16A should be sent back to the committee.

We were pleased that this course was followed because at that time all of us were concerned with national issues. We were looking forward to debating several measures of fundamental importance to the physical well report and legislation stemming from it, and I was expecting momentarily the presentation of legislation designed to assist fishermen