

*Business of the House*

tive nature of many of the speeches and at the reading-in of quotations from newspapers in speeches made at the second reading stage.

I should like to echo the words uttered by my colleague earlier on when he said that some opposition members would like to use this House as a debating society rather than as a legislative body. During some of the other filibusters to which I have listened in the 18 months that I have been here I noticed that precisely the same speech is often made at the second reading stage, at the report stage, and at the third reading stage, not to mention in committees.

In contrast to all this are the very constructive and thoughtful suggestions that have been made in the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization by opposition members, many of whom seem to have taken the position that it would be a great saving to have the major debate on bills at third reading. Many members from both sides of the House have suggested that the second reading should be preliminary, with committee and report stage investigative and orderly, and the major debate coming at the third reading stage after hon. members have had the opportunity to study the intent of the bill carefully and to give it a clause by clause examination.

Some members of the opposition have said today that the government side is confrontational in its attitude. I do not think that any party has a monopoly on confrontation, but I think it is a matter of great urgency that there be more co-operation on all sides of the House and that we stop these absurd filibusters and get on with the business of the nation.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Miss Nicholson:** I recognize the right of the opposition parties to make known their points of view clearly, but not to delay and indulge in repetitive and lengthy speeches which are quite devoid of constructive suggestions. Sending work to committees is one of the methods that was devised to deal with parliament's ever increasing work load. May I suggest that it would be in our interest to send this bill to committee and for those members who wish to improve it to move amendments there.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West):** Cease your applause, you fellows, you are cutting down on my time.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson). It is nice to have the contribution of a lady's comments in the House, even though she views the situation through rose coloured glasses. When she speaks about preventive medical care as something which we see every day in medical practice, the fact is that so far as looking after all the ills of humanity is concerned preventive medical care in the context referred to by the hon. member for Trinity is years down the line. She also referred to the presence of the CMA president before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, but she failed to mention that it was not in the context of Bill C-68. That bill was not before the committee then, and that will be the time for the hon. member to make that statement. It certainly does not apply right now.

[Miss Nicholson.]

Let us get on with the problem of Bill C-68 and why we are talking about it today.

**Miss Nicholson:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member accept a question?

**Mr. Brisco:** I will accept a question but only after I have finished my comments in ten minutes.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** May I remind the hon. member that if he speaks for ten minutes he will need unanimous consent to reply to the question.

**Mr. Brisco:** I will take that chance, Mr. Speaker.

**An hon. Member:** Chicken.

**Mr. Brisco:** It is patently obvious that on the subject of closure the skulk of foxes on the other side have turned into a flurry of rabbits. Last night the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) informed the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs that on March 16 and 17 a contingent of provincial deputy ministers will arrive in Ottawa. And certainly they do not want to be greeted by the fact that Bill C-68 is still before the House at second reading in April, on the 27th and 28th, when a contingent of provincial ministers of health arrive in Ottawa. It would be the hope of the government that it could by then have forced this bill through committee and through third reading. That is why we are going through this exercise.

● (1700)

The government House leader today complained bitterly about the filibustering of this bill. He said it has been before the House since July 6. I remind the minister that Bill C-58 was before the House from April 5 until very recently. There was no attempt at that time to filibuster; he failed to mention that.

**Mr. Sharp:** I used 75c on that bill too.

**Mr. Brisco:** The comparisons are just not the same. Let us consider the terms of Bill C-58 and Bill C-68. Which is of the most national importance, the health of Canadians or whether we read *Time* and *Reader's Digest*?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brisco:** What it really amounts to is a question of priorities and the old game of confrontation. The hon. member for Trinity referred to confrontation. Let me assure the hon. member that there is only one party in this House which can engage in the game of confrontation, and that is the government party. We cannot engage in it. We engage in valuable debate, and if hon. members would care to read some of the intelligent remarks made by hon. members on this side they would understand why we have addressed our concerns so sincerely and in such a dedicated fashion time and time again with reference to this bill. They just do not get the message. It is the old game of Liberal arrogance and confrontation.

We saw the same thing when the former minister of finance introduced federal mining legislation taxing all mines and raw resource industries. That was the old game