

*Committee to Consider Business of House*

remitting it to a committee over which Your Honour presides, it seems to me that would be the preferable course.

Beyond that, I speak for my friends, I think, when I say that we will support the Prime Minister's motion and its main objective. If a committee is set up and if reasonable time is permitted to the committee to carry on its work, we will endeavour, in the same spirit in which we have operated in the last two sessions, to seek the objective which the Prime Minister set out as the principal objective of his motion.

I had intended to propose a small amendment to the Prime Minister's motion but I am not going to do so now. I simply wish to tell the committee what was in my mind before I heard what the Prime Minister had to say. I will read the amendment which I had thought it might be desirable to move as one that might commend itself to both sides of the house. It is these words:

That the motion be amended by striking out the words:

"and, in particular, to consider the desirability of repealing standing order No. 33 (closure rule)"; by substituting a semicolon for the full stop after the word "house" at the end of the motion; and by adding the following words:

"and that standing order No. 33 (closure rule) be hereby repealed."

I appreciate that there might be some difficulty and some embarrassment for the government and perhaps some other technical problems if I were to propose this amendment. Here, sir, I am speaking for myself, and while I may be taking a rather long chance I hope that what I am going to say will commend itself to my friends. I should like to appeal to the Prime Minister to adopt this suggestion. I do not say that he should use these precise words, and it might require unanimous consent for him to do so, but I would hope that this suggestion might commend itself to everyone in the house.

The Prime Minister, and I agree with him completely, says that this rule should never be used again. Let us take it off the books and let the committee start from there in the spirit that would be created by doing so. It seems to me that would give us even greater hopes than we might otherwise have of making real progress in a matter about which I do feel we should seek to be as non-partisan as possible consistent with our duty.

Let me say that I have no apology for being partisan. It is through political parties that we have self government. I am not ashamed of that at all, and I know the Prime Minister is not either. But there are some matters with respect to which it is certainly preferable not to be partisan if the objective can be accomplished in any

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

other way. Rather than move this amendment I feel, therefore, that I should ask the Prime Minister whether he or his colleague the house leader, or someone else speaking for the government, would be prepared by consent and by agreement to dispose of this matter in this way, which I believe would be in the general interest. If I may, sir, I should like to send two copies of this document across the floor to the Prime Minister so that he may have the opportunity to look at it.

I say, sir, that we believe there is a real opportunity today to do something which will make parliament a better and more effective instrument for the service of the Canadian people, and I am sure everyone in the house is agreed that on this day, the anniversary of the Prime Minister's election to parliament, we would all like to do that.

**Mr. Erhart Regier (Burnaby-Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I also wish to add my words of congratulation to the Prime Minister on having been a member of parliament for 22 years. I can well remember the day on which he was first elected. I believe most people in his province were very proud of his election on that day 22 years ago.

I want to say at once that I am most appreciative of the consideration of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate in not moving his proposed amendment. This is a day, Mr. Speaker, on which parliament looks at itself, and I believe that every once in a while a look at ourselves is a welcome procedure. I am unable to agree with the proposal of the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. As I take it, he is proposing that the resolution should be amended to provide for the abolition here and now of standing order No. 33 without reference to a committee. While on many occasions I take advantage of my rights in the House of Commons to squeal, complain and shout as loudly as I can against actions of the government, to me the basic factor is that when the people of Canada give a majority to any particular party in an election, they also grant to that government the authority to have its way. To my mind the majority must prevail, Mr. Speaker, but the majority is strengthened when it pays proper respect to minority opinion.

I should not like to think we would ever manoeuvre ourselves into the position where an opposition group or groups would be able to frustrate the will of the duly elected government. Within recent days I have seen far too much of the ability of opposition groups in other countries to frustrate the will of the duly elected government. Inasmuch as we generally have elections every four years, I