

*Procedure and Organization*

75c and being aware of the objections of the other members, put the question against the wishes of the opposition. Since the Liberal members were in a majority on the committee, it is obvious that this majority won, but against the will of the three opposition parties.

Once again, believing the members were anxious to leave for their holidays, this report was introduced—we know how the government managed it—so that the members would lose interest in the proposal and give up.

Mr. Speaker, as far as we, members of the Ralliement Cr ditiste are concerned, for anybody, we do not intend to give up, because if the rule were passed, there would really be no more opposition. In fact, not only would the opposition disappear, but even government back-benchers would no longer be useful.

And I would even go as far as to say that the Speaker would no longer be useful since only the government would have its say. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would not need 28 ministers because five or six would be enough to rule or administer the country according to the wishes of a dictatorial prime minister.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we are justified in opposing such a proposal and we have the support of the Canadian people.

Lately, in my riding, I met a number of my constituents and I was asked the following question: Why is the house sitting at this time? Then, following my explanation, they said: Do not give up; carry on. You cannot give up, protect your rights.

Mr. Speaker, we are sitting at a time when hon. members, to whatever party they belong, should be with their constituents in order to consult them, to hear about their wishes and to report on their mandate, asking the people if they are satisfied with the legislation which has been passed since the beginning of the session.

It seems that only the Prime Minister can manage to feel the pulse of the people, and according to reports we have heard, there is every reason to believe that he is not getting such a warm welcome. I hope that when he returns, he will have realized that the Canadian voters, especially in the west, are not satisfied with his administration.

Mr. Speaker, at this time we are discussing a matter which has no interest for the Canadian taxpayers while we should be

[Mr. Laprise.]

studying legislation likely to improve the lot of the unemployed. There are too many unemployed in Canada even during the most active period of the year. There are still people looking for work and who cannot find any.

Furthermore, thousands of young students would like to earn a few dollars during their summer holidays so as to pay part of their tuition fees, but they cannot do it.

Many things could be discussed. For example, the producers of industrial milk, especially those in eastern Canada, are faced with serious problems. People are waiting.

The western farmers are also faced with serious problems and the government does not offer any solution. It is studying, it will see, it will inquire. It does not suggest anything to improve this situation.

What could be done to improve the lot of the Canadian workers? Many bills could be introduced in order to improve the situation of our wood workers, miners, construction workers, industrial workers in shipbuilding, transportation and so on. We could do much better than discuss procedure and organization. However, we are forced to hang around here. We are forced to wait and to discuss a subject about which the government knows beforehand it will have to give in.

Mr. Speaker, how can this debate stop the increase in the cost of living? Yet, all the Canadian consumers are asking that this steady increase in the cost of living be curbed because it annoys everybody.

How can this debate solve the housing problem? We constantly get representations from our constituents asking that the government attend to this problem. However, the government does not propose anything. We are forced to hang about and to discuss subjects that are entirely different from those in which our constituents are interested.

Mr. Speaker, on December 10 last, when a similar debate was held on Standing Order 16A, my colleague the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) said, and I quote from page 3779 of *Hansard*:

However, one must not think that parliamentary reform will solve at once the economic problem of Canadians. A better parliamentary procedure does not necessarily mean a better government, because a government is not judged merely by the value of the measures it adopts. We can have a better procedure and pass legislation more rapidly but, if the opposition is governed by a mediocre procedure, it can hardly do much better. This means that the government must introduce legislation that will meet the needs of the Canadian people.