

*Summer Recess*

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that, in general, my experience as parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has been interesting. It has enabled me to see to what extent I was right to complain about our rules and it is urgent to make these changes. It has enabled me to see also to what extent in negotiations to expedite the proceedings of the House, certain people can sometimes be petty and prevent us hypocritically to reach valid and honest objectives for the people of Canada. I cannot congratulate everyone with whom I have discussed or negotiated. However, several of them, and I want to make this clear, have acted in good faith and in a climate of honest co-operation. In the same spirit, I want to thank sincerely—I shall name only one so that some people do not feel uncomfortable—but I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who, given his knowledge of our Standing Orders, has always been frank and honest with me and has helped us go forward in a progressive way. I think his advice has been judicious and we should pay tribute to him in this debate. I would like it if in the future, when we schedule the legislative program of a session, we were able to depend on and believe in the word we are given.

I would be happy if we were always in a position to plan our legislative work in such a way that, when we go back to the people during recess, we do not have anything to say about our opponents' parliamentary spirit. I complained about our Standing Orders, my colleague the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) complained about the parliamentary spirit in this House. Unfortunately in some cases I have witnessed, I must also regret that certain members of the opposition abused, as I said earlier, some procedures. I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to rise on a question of privilege in my concluding remarks, but comments like those made by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker), who just came into the House, are in my opinion unacceptable in a place like this. It seems to me that the House leader of the official opposition could have refrained today from describing this government as the most corrupt he and Canada have ever seen. He said absolutely nothing to prove his statement which is, obviously, not only unparliamentary but unworthy of a good citizen.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest authority in parliamentary procedure, Erskine May, mentions in the 19th edition, at page 445, that among the most unparliamentary terms, and he lists about thirty, are the words "corrupt" and "corruption". Beauchesne's *Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, also a well known authority in the matter, states in the fourth edition, at page 130, citation 155 of the English version, that the term "corrupt" is also quite unparliamentary. And again yesterday, when the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) was saying, and I quote from page 6860 of *Hansard*:

*[English]*

Mr. Speaker, the acts of the minister and the words of the minister have been described as despicable. They could be described as being beneath contempt, they could be described as being vicious and vulgar—

This expression is forbidden also by Beauchesne's and it is clearly established that "vicious" and "vulgar" are unparliamentary words.

*[Translation]*

Mr. Speaker, these words of despicable government, of vicious and vulgar words, were spoken by the House leader of the official opposition and are a poor example for the Canadian people who are observing us on television, of the attitude which should prevail in this chamber where we should not criticize individuals and tarnish reputations but rather criticize specific measures and discuss ideas. We should bring the debates in this House to a respectable level, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the attitude of the House leader of the official opposition has not contributed to raising the level of debates during the present session, and I truly regret it. That is the saddest aspect of my experiences as Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council, Mr. Speaker, and it is unfortunate that I should have to say it, and I purposely waited for the hon. House leader of the opposition to be present so that I could tell him to his face.

I noticed that when the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) was laying blame on him that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton left the chamber. I waited for his return to tell him to his face that I am saddened by his attitude. I regret that kind of attitude and I hope that in the future we will be able to work in a more professional way for the good of all Canadians, in a renewed parliament, in a parliament whose procedure will have been amended in good faith in order to be more dignified, more efficient and more adapted to our 1979 life style.

• (1522)

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, having listened to most of the speeches made since noon today, I have come to the conclusion that we should have adjourned as early as last night. I see that everything that has been said today was not very useful. Usually we wait until much later in the summer before adjourning for the recess, and I think that June 30 is either too soon or too late.

I noticed while listening to the speech of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs that he was very agitated, probably because he has been considerably irritated by the incidents of a few moments before, but whatever the reason, I think that his remarks were somewhat out of place. The minister complained about the proliferation of third parties or of political parties in Canada.

Well, for the minister's information, this is no novel thing in this House, and if third parties sprung up in Canada, it was precisely because of the failure of the older political parties. If they had given Canadians the kind of administration they were expecting from a good government, there would have been no need to create new political parties.