

*Standing Orders*

had to set up a number of informal committees and have had to meet with people outside of the committees of the House to discuss matters around luncheon tables. However, there has been no way for the concerns of these people to be registered on the record of the House or its committees. We will be creating such an avenue and I think this will help the House considerably.

I will conclude by stating one more point. The motion as it is presently drafted has not removed some of what I would call the archaic terms which are used when referring to people who will occupy the chairs of various committees of the House. The rules refer to chairmen on all occasions and we will be creating a panel of chairmen. Perhaps a modification is called for here. It would be more appropriate in today's day and age to refer to this panel as a panel of chairs.

*[Translation]*

The same is true in the French version for the "*Comité des présidents*". It would seem normal in 1986 to change this to the "*Comité des présidents et des présidentes de la Chambre*".

*[English]*

I have also noticed that petitions in English use language which is somewhat archaic. Average Canadian citizens must continue to pray to the House of Commons. In French, much more modern language is used. It would seem to me that if we are talking about bringing this House into the 20th century or perhaps even the 21st century, the language we use in our Standing Orders should reflect the same mentality. However, this change does not have to be made immediately. These are temporary rules and this is something which could be arrived at over the course of the next 10 months while rules are in the experimental stage.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak on this very important subject. I look forward to the implementation of these rules and I sincerely hope that the contributions of all Hon. Members of the House will be enhanced in the way we all wish to see them enhanced.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Member to elaborate on the issue he raised regarding the involvement of committees and the new spirit of co-operation in light of the problems surrounding full access to information on the de Havilland question.

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Speaker, I would answer the Hon. Member simply by stating that it is hoped that these committees will be able to determine on their own what matters are appropriate for their consideration and that there will not be a three-line Whip. It is hoped that party Members who serve on these committees will not be taking orders from their respective caucuses. If the practice used by the Regional Development Committee which wanted to study the de Havilland issue continues, I fear that we will not be making much progress.

I think many Hon. Members have recognized that a change in attitude is just as important as a change in the rules. I would hope that in a true spirit of reform, the members of these committees will be working independently and not taking

instructions from their caucuses. I do not think that is what is intended by reform. However, only time will tell if this proves to be the case.

**Mr. W. R. Bud Jardine (Northumberland-Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker—

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

**Mr. Jardine:** I know this kind applause is not for this speaker nor is it for the Speaker in the Chair but, rather, for the reform which we are discussing today. The importance of parliamentary reform for the House was indeed underscored by its being the first item mentioned in the Throne Speech of the Government. That point has been made before. It was made yesterday and again a couple of times today. Personally, I do not think that the point can be made enough times.

The importance of reform was further strengthened when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) himself rose to speak on the issue. Not only did he speak on the issue yesterday but he was present during the presentation made by the Chairman of the committee today and lent his support to it.

• (1700)

There can be no doubt about the resolve of the Government and of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to proceed with reform, thereby enhancing the role of the private Member of Parliament. It is also worth noting the words of the Chairman of the special committee on reform who said, upon being appointed chairman, that he considered it to be the most important undertaking with which he had been associated in his 28 years on the Hill.

I am most pleased to have this opportunity to speak briefly on reform since I had the privilege of attending a number of meetings as an alternate member of the committee. I would like to say—and I do not mean to be repetitive in praise, and I certainly do not mean it as false praise—that I doubt very much that we would be at this point at this time had it not been for the leadership and direction of the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) who chaired the committee. It was not by accident that there was a strong bond of collegiality among the members and a great willingness to resolve all points by consensus. In fact, this was really my first exposure to a parliamentary committee at work. In retrospect, not only will I say that I was spoiled but perhaps I was ill-prepared for other committees to which I was later appointed. Unfortunately, I did not always see that same sense of purpose and collegiality at work in those other committees.

While I have had occasion to speak before in the House, I have not taken the opportunity to pay tribute or recognize in the House the good people of my riding of Northumberland-Miramichi through whose valued support I am here today. With the indulgence of Hon. Members I beg leave at this point to describe briefly that beautiful place in the Province of New Brunswick called Miramichi from whence I come. Hon. Members might ask why I would take this opportunity to speak about that subject at this time. Frankly, I cannot think of a