

*Business of the House*

however, to know whether it will be necessary to have a recess until the end of September unless we know when we are likely to adjourn.

Members of this party are anxious to cooperate with the government in its plans to have a proper and adequate celebration of Canada's centennial year. We wish to help in every way we can with these celebrations in our constituencies and throughout the country. However, Mr. Speaker, we are convinced that the first business of parliament is to do the work of the country. We believe there is no better way in which we can celebrate Canada's 100th birthday than to devote ourselves to the problems which confront the Canadian people.

A short summer recess certainly would be advisable, but in our opinion there is no reason for a long summer recess. If we should be able to adjourn by the latter part of June, there is no reason that parliament could not reassemble after Labour day. Two or two and a half months would seem to be an adequate time to enable members to attend to the work in their constituencies and take part in these centennial celebrations.

While I agree that the items the Prime Minister has outlined are very essential, I should like to point out to the house that there are many items which were not listed. There is nothing mentioned about the setting up of a department of consumer affairs which is likely to be recommended by the committee on consumer credit or to deal with the whole question of the rising cost of living. There is nothing mentioned about legislation on divorce or on birth control, both of which have been studied by a committee of the house. There is nothing mentioned about hate literature, which also has been recommended, or about anti-pollution legislation, or car safety.

There is nothing mentioned dealing with the matter of Canada's constitution or dealing with—as I hope will be the case in 1967—the report of the bicultural and bilingual commission. Certainly there can be no more appropriate year than 1967 to begin to grapple with this problem.

I should like to recommend to the Prime Minister at this time that we move with speed in respect of the setting up of the committee to look into the rules and procedures of the house, particularly if we are to get any agreement concerning which of the present rules will be extended into the next session, so that we do not come to the end of this session with the subject unresolved. This would give us

the necessary time to explore the whole question of further revision of the rules so we could carry on our business much more expeditiously. Certainly I would hope that out of such a committee would come plans for the setting up of a parliamentary timetable, the first step toward which has been taken by the Prime Minister's announcement today.

I should like to say to the Prime Minister that while we are just as anxious as anyone to get back to our constituencies for a short summer recess, we shall insist throughout this session that the primary responsibility of parliament is to deal with the items the Prime Minister has mentioned and some other items which have not been mentioned. This must have top priority. There is no better way we can serve Canada in its centenary than to devote ourselves to the task of finding some solutions to the many problems which confront the Canadian people at this time.

**Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic):** Mr. Speaker, in glancing over the timetable which the Prime Minister has given to us for the next few months, it seems to me that if we live on hope we certainly have a lot to live on. As the hon. member for Ontario has stated, there is enough mentioned here to justify a throne speech debate and a full session. I quite agree that it is a step forward on the part of the government and I thank the Prime Minister for having taken this initiative in giving us some chronology in respect of the business of the house. This at least gives us an objective, but the dates which have been mentioned are not realistic and are not fair to the proper handling of the legislation which it is desired should be passed through the house.

My experience in this house has not been very lengthy, but I know that all the items which have been mentioned cannot be pushed through and digested in the short period which is being allowed. Some other measures have been mentioned here by other members who have spoken, and there are the estimates themselves. The study of the estimates can take a considerable time even if we just give two days to each department. I foresee a very long debate on the armed forces bill. I am not attempting to pull the wool over anyone's eyes, but it is going to take quite some time to deal with this matter. Anyone who believes otherwise has been asleep for the past six months. I believe it would be nice if we could get out of here on April 3, but I do not intend to be lured into the position of saying "Well, we are going to get out on the third and be damned with the rest". That is not the point.