

I know there is competition between Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and the other party which thinks it is going to be Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, regardless of what Premier Bob Rae is doing in Ontario—and I am not going to get into that of course—but the opposition has to decide before it agrees to adjourn. It has to say: "Okay, government House leader, we will agree to adjourn but what bills are we going to pass? What bills are we going to turn over to a new Parliament."

From what I understand as a result of some of the discussion and debate here today, I do not think that was discussed or defined very well. I am suggesting that the opposition had better start to decide whether it is an opposition to a government that it, from its point of view, quite properly, and from the public point of view, has properly condemned. It had better decide whether it is really going to oppose, not obstruct but oppose, or whether it is going to be a hypocrite and oppose in rhetoric and then cave in when the moment of truth comes.

I do not know if this debate is going to go its full course. I know that, from a government point of view, we used to discuss this. We would say: "Oh don't worry about the opposition, it is going to cave in at about eight o'clock or nine o'clock. Don't worry fellows, at eleven o'clock you will be able to catch your planes."

There is some of that feeling here tonight. The government will start to pick up its ears. Government members are as human as any of us in the opposition or in the independent row. I am the dean of the independents. They are all there to my left. I start the row here. They are all human and they do not like to be here either. They want to know if we are really serious or not. Already, when this motion was put this afternoon, I saw two chairpersons over here talking to opposition members, obviously looking for consent on certain things. Either the organizational committee is meeting tomorrow to set up the committees or whatever.

The opposition has to decide, if this government is as odious as it says and the public and polls believe, to oppose, not obstruct but oppose. The opposition cannot oppose by making a rhetorical speech in the House of Commons on rule changes. In effect, this opposition has already been sandbagged on the rule changes that came in before we got out on one of those hiccup pauses. It got

Government Orders

bamboozled on the rule changes and now we have a motion like this and I really do not know if we are even going to carry the debate until eleven o'clock.

I will come back to what I said before, as Prime Minister Trudeau found out—and thank God he brought the Constitution back. I used to be a lawyer, and I am not going to argue with the Supreme Court decision about the convention, which in effect said: "Mr. Prime Minister, you can do what you are doing legally, but the convention says you should have some approval from the provinces."

There was another federal-provincial conference and we all know what happened. Thank God the Constitution came back, for which I give Prime Minister Trudeau full credit. All the talk about Meech Lake, all the things said by the present Prime Minister and his revision of history, is totally intellectually dishonest. If we had not had the repatriation of the Constitution, we never would have had the opportunity for Meech Lake, even though it was botched a year ago today. Even then, with the Prime Minister speaking, with a majority government, the Supreme Court said: "Hey, Mr. Prime Minister, there is such a thing as a convention".

I am fundamentally disappointed and sick in my heart that the Speaker of this House, a friend of mine, made a peremptory decision to allow this motion to stand in order. I said in the preliminary debate before he made his ruling that there are no precedents. I asked the government parliamentary secretary: "What precedent do you have for what you are trying to do"? The parliamentary secretary knew, and I knew before I asked the question, that there was no parliamentary principle. There was no parliamentary precedent to try to do what we are doing here.

I have been in Parliaments before where, by consent, before we prorogued we made a House order putting bills A, B, C, D and E in the same position in the new House as they were in the old House. Also, when the new House came in, by consent order, we agreed to elevate certain bills into the stage they were at before prorogation. All of them by consent. However, we have, this time, a complete abdication and ignorance of the fundamental parliamentary tradition allowing the opposition to speak and hold the Parliament and the government to a time clock—and if it does not beat the time clock and get all the bills through by prorogation it would be able to make a deal, or at least try to make a new deal,