

session, have an opportunity to bring into place the work of the committee members who worked unanimously, by consensus, without a vote, every one of whom had the idea that this place is worth preserving, enhancing and enriching and that all of those things were badly needed.

It is in that spirit, ignoring whatever will be said personally, that I ask the House to concur today in the fifth report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures, which is a simple, straightforward matter, to augment and round out what we did in the third report, under which the House is now operating.

Some Hon. Members: Question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, even if I indicated earlier, when I rose on a point of order, that I thought it was most unfortunate to have a situation where we are forced to debate the matter at this time, I am prepared to set aside those grievances for the time being and to address the substance of the question and at the same time take advantage of this opportunity to try and be as objective and fair as possible, and—without further reference to the attitude of the Hon. Member who just spoke—draw the attention of the House in all sincerity to the extraordinary work that has been accomplished by all members of the Special Committee on Parliamentary Reform during the last 18 months. I wish to stress the impartiality and good judgment of and the excellent work done by, the Chairman, the Member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle (Mr. Lefebvre) who managed to make the members of his Committee work on a sustained and regular basis, while at the same time being flexible enough to set aside differences of opinion in order to reach a consensus on matters that were often delicate and always very important. I think he has shown extraordinary ability and that his work is fully deserving of praise at this time.

I also want to congratulate in general the Members on both sides of the House who gave the Committee the benefit of their experience and expertise and who via common effort attempted to find the necessary means by which Parliament could be more progressive, could improve itself and reform its procedure.

Having said this, I would like to understand why, under the leadership of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), certain Members of the Committee believe that now is the appropriate time for the immediate concurrence of the seven reports of the Committee although they have not yet been considered by the House of Commons. I am honestly trying to understand what rationale or explanation would justify—

An Hon. Member: Because Parliament is going to be prorogued!

Mr. Pinard: I do not believe that shouting or interrupting me can add anything significant to the debate. I am simply

Report of Special Committee

asking a question. Following your comments, Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the previous speaker and I would like the opportunity to express my views because I am very much in favour of parliamentary reform and I would not want what happened yesterday and today to jeopardize in any way sooner or later the improvement of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons and the rules of the Canadian Parliament. On the contrary I believe that, these last few years, Members on this side, as well as across the way admittedly, have showed their willingness to bring about certain changes. We have made some in the past. We are now making some more and we shall continue to do so.

Where some might disagree is as to the way to proceed, and this is important. The third report deals with the changes we are now putting to the test. This report suggests a whole series of important changes to our rules. If it was felt necessary to have an experiment of at least one year before considering a permanent implementation of these changes, why should seven other reports be suddenly implemented at once as was suggested yesterday and earlier today? Should they be implemented without any preliminary experience, without waiting for the results of the experiment now being made even though many of the changes proposed in these seven reports are even more complex and would have more serious consequences than those we are now trying? I ask the question sincerely and honestly. If an experience of at least twelve months was required for a single important report, which was also the result of a consensus and which had received the unanimous agreement of the Committee, why, suddenly at this time, near the end of the debate on the Crow rate, are some members attempting to have us implement at once seven reports, without the benefit of experience?

I believe that this question should be answered. I should like to know the reasons for such a rush. I respectfully point out that these reports do not necessarily result from our present experience. One of them, the fourth, deals with the appointment of the Speaker of the House. The fifth would force the Government to establish the committees without delay. As for me, I have nothing against it but it must be considered in the larger context. In the other reports provision is made for the appointment of special legislative committees made up of 20 members in addition to the 20 or so existing committees, to deal specifically with bills following the second reading stage. Another report proposes the establishment of four additional committees to examine the fiscal framework, the spending habits of the Government and the use of Crown corporations. Another report provides for a change in the accountability of those in charge of administering public funds. We know that this is the Government's responsibility. It is proposed that Members of the Opposition attend the meetings of the Commissioners of Internal Economy and share in the administration of over \$100 million a year of taxpayers' money and that,