

Adjournment Motion

toughness in debate, the firmness and logic, the depth of understanding and the difference of the parties in this respect should carry over into a lack of respect about the other party. I take that to be a matter of great significance for a democracy. There must be a will in the parties to accept the difference of view that is on the other side of the House or between the two parties on this side of the House, a will that says that whatever our differences are we can agree on procedures to resolve those differences, and that however we may differ in philosophy and program, we can agree on the methods of coming to decisions.

But this requires an attitude of trust between the parties. It is my judgment, rightly or wrongly, that we would not have undergone what we did in the past two weeks if there had not been a breakdown of trust. I say that in terms of the other two larger parties in this House. For whatever reason, and I will not speculate on the causes, there was no trust or respect between them in terms of procedure about the importance of parliamentary democracy. For whatever reason, bad feeling that got beyond differences in policy and bad feeling that got beyond differences in philosophy interfered with the effective working of Parliament.

When we look back at the past 16 days, it will be realized that Canadians witnessed an unfortunate spectacle. Canadians saw that the men and women elected to do a job were not there to do it. In my view, these men and women did not do their job because of a lack of fundamental respect for each other, a respect that is so essential for the functioning of our democratic system. As a result of that, who suffered? While we were not sitting, public business certainly suffered. We did not deal with legislation that ought to have been dealt with. Housing problems were not met. Programs were not initiated to deal with unemployment. As a result, the public suffered. Politicians also suffered because the level of respect felt across the country for this institution and its members in my view diminished. But more important, because we are a democratic country, our society somehow suffered in a broader sense than that conveyed in the economic issues to which I have just referred.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for York North (Mr. Gamble)—Finance—(a) Change in application of sales tax—possible remissions of excess tax, (b) Inquiry respecting government's intention; the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert)—

Public Service—Implementation of special committee recommendations on employer-employee relations; the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Hudecki)—Justice and Legal Affairs—National mobility of lawyers.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

The House resumed consideration of the motion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark):

That in the view of this House the future effectiveness of Parliament as a democratic assembly, representing the needs, beliefs and aspirations of the people of Canada, requires that an immediate review of all its rules and practices proceed without further delay, and this House therefore urges the government to refer the document "Position Paper: The Reform of Parliament", tabled on November 23, 1979, to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization as a basis for commencing discussion, along with proposals for reforming the budgetary process.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): The allotted time for the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) has expired. He may, however, continue with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Benjamin: That is another rule change that we need.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I will not abuse the consideration of the House in allowing me to continue. I want to conclude by saying that a number of good suggestions have been made by all parties in this debate. I think the committee should get on with its work and that we should modernize our rules and procedures to improve the efficiency of government and the effective participation of Members of Parliament.

I want to emphasize also that we should not be deluded when we make these changes, as I hope we will, into believing that once they are there everything will function well. What has to be done and done now for this Parliament to perform effectively for the rest of its term is to restore a sense of trust between the parties so that we can work within that framework to debate the serious differences in policy that we have.

[Translation]

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Rosemont): Mr. Speaker, I agree with those members who, in referring to the parliamentary deadlock we have experienced during the past two weeks, concluded that some good might come out of all this and that perhaps the experience would strengthen the resolve of all the members of this House to address the problems of parliamentary reform in a concrete manner and without further delay. It is a truism to say that we all have our views on the subject. We