

*Dollar Items*

tolls which, to use the logic of the Atlantic Tories, they would quadruple.

The tragedy of the procedures of this House is not only that members of the opposition, by conducting themselves in this way, can thereby demonstrate why they are all in agreement on voting against a particular measure. They have two reasons for voting against it; they have one set of members who say it is too good, another who say it is too bad. They are always on both sides of every issue. It would be tragedy enough, Mr. Speaker, if they were just occupying the time of the House, but it is a double tragedy when they go into their own regions time after time and suggest that this is an example of democracy not working and of this government being unfair to their particular region. Not only do they take up hour after hour in this House, but they then agree to vote against a bill on second reading having in their own particular territory demonstrated their reason for doing so.

I said in my argument yesterday in this House on the question of principle that when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put forward what he thought would be better rules he may have touched some rather good points. I hope those rules will see the day when we have so organized the House that the business which needs to be put before it can be so put, so the House can come in a deliberate way to a vote on all the business before it during the parliamentary year, instead of being prevented, by delay and dilatory tactics on the part of the opposition, from doing so.

● (2020)

The day when the rules of this House allow for expeditious disposition of business, a great deal of different approaches may be possible. However, that day will not come with any blessing from the opposition. They love delay. They will not ever sensibly agree to arrangements that move business through this House.

If the leader of the Tory party in the House, who is pointing his finger at me and objecting, could ever honestly say what time a bill would take, with any knowledge of what the members behind him were going to do about it, then we would make progress.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** We ran out of business on Friday because you were not ready.

**Mr. Lang:** They ran out of business on Friday. Look at the history of this House. Look at the history of the opposition. I ask any honest member of the public to read through opposition speeches where they can see irrelevancy after irrelevancy for the purpose of delaying legislation and stopping this House from coming to decisions upon matters.

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

**Mr. Lang:** I have no doubt there are many times when it will be desirable for there to be a time interval between different phases and stages of House business so that there can be consideration, and indeed deliberation in the country in connection with it. However, there ought to be an orderly system

[Mr. Lang.]

so that the House time here is not taken up with members talking about anything and everything, but about nothing whatever to do with the substance of a bill before us, simply to get on the record whatever it might be that is on their minds anywhere in relation to the subject. That, of course, can be very broadly interpreted.

This motion by the opposition in simple terms has demonstrated the bankruptcy of their ideas, the absolute lack of substantial argument upon which they are willing to stand together as a party and come forward positively with proposals. This demonstrates it more than anything else.

If the leader of the Tory party in the House has indeed indicated that they are prepared to consider rule changes which will make effective the role of this parliament in passing legislation, instead of constantly allowing his backbenchers to continue wasting time and stopping matters coming to a decision, we will at least have come to something of substance and have accomplished something this day which this motion obviously could not, or never was intended to do.

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

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the minister is used to speaking only within the forum of news conferences and making announcements outside this House, I want to express my utter relief that he can still be a coherent if not necessary logical speaker in this House.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member gave the Chair the impression he was seeking the floor for the purpose of debate. He has prevented one of his members from speaking. I will therefore recognize the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin).

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on reading the motion presented today by the Official Opposition, I particularly like the last three lines which read:

—and additionally, circumvents the right of the House to fully discuss the creation of new policies, programs and agencies.

I have heard no justification or argument against that today from any of the government spokesmen. I listened with particular care to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang). He made no mention whatever of the justification for the \$1 items standing in the name of the Department of Transport in the supplementary estimates.

The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Sharp), the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), and the Minister of Transport have criticized and ridiculed the Official Opposition for their failure to present motions on their opposition days that deal with vital matters and issues that concern this country. Whether or not the government spokesmen are right, surely that is purely the business of the Official Opposition. Whatever motions they decide to move is entirely up to them.

I find it difficult to understand why the government would blame the opposition for not bringing forward these major issues on their opposition days when they have all the other days to bring forward legislation, budgets, or anything else on