

*Interim Supply*

Minister on May 15. I think some parts of this editorial are worth considering. It said:

The House of Commons did not look at its best when Prime Minister Pearson announced the 20 pieces of legislation that must be passed before the summer recess, and many members of the house laughed at him.

To some extent all this is due to the government's minority position and the restive mood of a house that is not disposed to allow the government to forget its thin hold on power. But there is more to it than this. The trouble also comes from the fact that the business of the house, the amount and order of legislation, is not being frankly worked out between the government and the opposition.

It goes on to say:

The need for a frank understanding between government and opposition would not in any way limit the freedom of criticism and debate. It is, rather, a matter of the proper management of business.

I recommend the whole editorial to all members of the house. I think the Prime Minister was being unfair and rather stupid in introducing the amount of legislation he did introduce in the way that he did, if he honestly and with any integrity expected the house to pass this legislation before having any recess this summer. I think that we in Canada should start looking at improving the affairs of government, and one of the major ways of doing this is by dividing the session off in accordance with the arrangements they use in the United Kingdom, where they divide the financial section of the session and the legislation section of the session. As most hon. members will know, this was done a long time ago, because they encountered the same problem that faces us, namely that you cannot mix the budget resolutions and the throne speech legislation and try to deal with them at the same time and expect to accomplish very much with either.

No one in this chamber has ever gone to a meeting run by any organization which had any understanding at all of the operation of an organization—certainly this has been the experience of anyone who has attended meetings on a regular basis—where an agenda had not been prepared and it was decided that there would be a limited, and only a limited, amount of new business introduced in that agenda. The agenda is presented; those present at the meeting are asked to approve, add to or delete from the agenda, and the agenda is adopted. That is the way the business is carried out.

I have just looked over the number of things the Prime Minister suggested had to be passed. I have totalled them up. I may be out one or two, but I totalled 35 items. I do not know when his week end is going to come, but if he does not run the house better than it appears to be run at the moment he can count on that week end some time very late in the

fall, because members of parliament are already taking their holidays and would be quite happy to see that he has the opportunity to stay here during July and August if he wishes to do that.

I have read the list. Some of these measures are important; some of them have been put off by us for five years, and I do not understand how he thinks we are going to pass them all of a sudden. Some of them are just wishes; some of them are just election promises; some of them have great priority and should be discussed—but I think it is very unfair, unrealistic, and is a very poor way to run a government if we are going to continue to hold a gun to the heads of members of parliament every time a period arises when we normally expect to have some recess, and this type of situation is put before us. There is not a member in this house who has not decided in the last two or three years that this is a full-time job, that we have an obligation to be here almost the year round. There is, except for elections, a limited period of time in which a member is able to visit his constituency and make a complete tour of his area.

I think we should decide now when that period will be. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that it does not satisfy me to have a recess some time during the winter, when I come from northern Ontario. It is neither handy for me nor advantageous to my constituents. In the rural areas we may sit around a stove while we discuss particular problems, but I think it is much better if they were discussed out in the fields with the sun pouring down, giving a guy a break from his haying or harvesting.

We should also give consideration to the interests of members of parliament with families and young children. If this is done we will find that the best time for a holiday will be somewhere around July and August. If this holiday period could extend to some six or eight weeks I think the date should be set for July 1 to end of August, and that this decision should be taken now.

What would this decision mean, Mr. Chairman? It would mean that the government would have immediately to consult with the other members of parliament, or if they do not wish to do that they would have to publish—perhaps this is by far the best method—a list, a really honest list, as to the things it is desirable to accomplish. This list could be made available to the press, if they want to do it in other ways than in the past; and then it will rest on the shoulders of every member of parliament, no matter from which party or quarter of the house he may come, to give his co-operation and achieve the result desired within a reasonable length of