

House can agree so that Parliament may work in an efficient, civilized, modern and productive manner.”

The Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party never agreed to negotiate any aspect of a single of those 16 bills, neither to draw up our work schedule and to determine the length of the debate nor to decide how much time the various stages of those bills required, quite the opposite! Undoubtedly that was not in keeping with the strategy of the Progressive Conservative Party which had to come to grips with its internal leadership problems and which opted instead for making every attempt to catch the Government off guard in a vote so as to trigger an election before having to decide the fate of their leader in Winnipeg and at the Civic Centre in a few days.

It is unfortunate that the Official Opposition chose to undermine the parliamentary process as a result of its internal squabbles. It is a sad comment, Mr. Speaker, but I think that was the real cause of the shameful incidents we have witnessed. Members of the Progressive Conservative Party have been frustrated, first in December 1979 when they lost power after only 37 days into the session, and ever since in their internal leadership crisis which has dictated their approach, their outlook and their behaviour with respect to the parliamentary system. For the first time in our history, we saw a party resort to such drastic means as the bell ringing incident to prevent rather than promote debate, to undermine the very essence of Parliament, in short, to torpedo Canada's democratic system by putting an end to any constructive debate in the House and systematically preventing this institution from tackling major issues.

I conclude by expressing the hope that after my remarks Hon. Members will keep in mind the fact that we have shown respect for Parliament and that we want to do even better, but that calls for co-operation from both sides of the House and not only from the Government. That cannot be achieved without good will on the part of the Opposition, and we are always prepared to do our best so that Parliament will be ever more efficient, humane, modern and respected by the people.

[English]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question. One wonders, when one hears the Government House Leader, with all of the confidence he has about the many things we are doing wrong, why he does not simply call an election and take the issue to the polls, to the people.

Mr. Pinard: That's exactly the problem.

Mr. Lewis: Why does he not do that right now? I would invite him to do it right now. Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader has continually referred to what he feels was unanimous support for the rules passed in 1969. I want to draw the Government House Leader's attention to the book by John B. Stewart entitled "The Canadian House of Commons, Procedure and Reform", specifically to page 250. The Government House Leader has continually suggested that these rules

were passed unanimously. On page 250, Mr. Stewart makes the following point:

Six months later, on 20 June 1969, the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization fulfilled the order of the House by recommending three new standing orders: 75A, 75B, and 75C. These were adopted, without alteration, by the House at the sitting of 24 July 1969, but only after closure had been used to terminate a filibuster by all the opposition parties.

Mr. Pinard: Standing Orders 75A, B and C? You're not talking about the same thing. That is not supply.

Mr. Lewis: I would refer to *Hansard* for July 24, 1969, at page 11619, wherein it is reported there was a vote in which the yeas and nays were recorded. The Government, the majority, steamrollered through the closure and then on July 24, 1969, the rules were finally passed, on closure, on a recorded vote in which the Opposition of the day voted against the rules.

I want to ask one simple question of the Government House Leader. Should we change *Hansard* and the book by John B. Stewart, or should the Government House Leader revise his version of what happened when those rules came in, in order to comply with the truth?

Mr. Smith: You're all mixed up, Doug.

• (1230)

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, just one point. One simply has to read and understand. The Hon. Member is talking about a vote after closure that took place merely to implement Standing Order 75A, B and C. That is absolutely not what I was talking about and that is absolutely not what his interim leader was talking about in his speech. We were talking about Opposition days, the Business of Supply. That is the reform and those are the rules to which I was referring and to which his leader was referring when I quoted *Hansard* and the *Journals*.

I would seek unanimous consent to table the proper extract from Commons *Debates* and the House of Commons *Journals* that very clearly demonstrate that in fact the Business of Supply, the Opposition days, were adopted unanimously by this House of Commons. I hope this consent will not be denied.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) asks unanimous consent to table a document. Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to give unanimous consent if first I can see the documents ahead of time and, second, if we can also have unanimous consent to table the truth in the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the President of the Privy Council to table the document?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Smith: They do not like the truth.