

trary, the motion under study will amend S.O. 58 dealing with the business of supply and ways and means in that opposition parties, will come out the winners as they will have much more latitude to criticize, to analyse and to debate the estimates and to do so in an orderly fashion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do want to believe in the good will of opposition parties on the necessity of disposing within reasonable time of this backlog, and in particular what we are discussing today, the business of supply. The Progressive Conservative Party which so far has failed to agree on this kind of order of the House and failed to make counterproposals. In the consideration of this motion for a special order of the House, a consideration that I hope will be very short so we can dispose of the very large number of other urgent bills that have accumulated as a result of the two successive elections we have had in a year, I am confident the Progressive Conservative Party will prove reasonable and show the good will that is hoped for by His Excellency the Governor General.

I am confident, and I say so in all sincerity, that that party will allow us to work effectively because we are offering them in that order something more generous than what the opposition normally gets under the rules of this House. And I am sure that my colleague, the Leader of the Official Opposition in this House, is going to co-operate so as to ensure that that good will is there. I am convinced he will give us the proof in this debate that that good will being required by His Excellency the Governor General is possible between the three parties in this House, and that is why today I ask the Progressive Conservative Party to accept the generosity of the government, to admit that indeed the proposed order is much more generous than the otherwise applicable rules of this House. Furthermore, I am quite aware that there might be a debate perhaps to get some explanations on the required order of the House but I think the Progressive Conservative Party today has an excellent opportunity to prove it is anxious to see Parliament dispose effectively of the legislative business that has accumulated as a result of an extraordinary situation, namely, two elections in less than a year.

● (1530)

[English]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and for purposes of clarification. I know that the President of the Privy Council would not want to mislead the House intentionally. He has made references throughout his presentation with respect to statements made by His Excellency the Governor General in the course of the throne speech debate as though this was the personal request of the Governor General. I was speaking with the Governor General just the other day, Mr. Speaker, and he never mentioned a word about this particular problem.

Supplementary Estimates (A)

● (1540)

I wonder if the President of the Privy Council would want to make it quite clear on the record that the Speech from the Throne, although read by the Governor General, is set down by none other than the Prime Minister and his cabinet, including the hon. President of the Privy Council.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the throne speech that I quoted speaks for itself. As for the ways my colleague might want to interpret it and the private conversations that he might have had with those who helped draft the throne speech, I cannot vouch for them, I was not there. But the passage I quoted is evidence of the fact that there is in this country a desire for the government to stop dragging its feet and carry out its business more efficiently. That was all I wanted to convey by quoting the very words of the throne speech, and we want to act, Mr. Speaker, in the greatest respect for the rights of the Progressive Conservative Party and other opposition parties. In that regard we want to give the opposition parties more scope and more time than stipulated in the standing orders. That is exactly what is proposed in the motion now before us.

Therefore I ask the hon. member on what principle he refuses such generosity from the government. I think his position is illogical.

[English]

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is at all fair for anyone to blame the Governor General for the contents of the speech he read two and one half weeks ago. I am glad that the hon. member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) has pointed out to the people of Canada that it is not the Governor General who is responsible for the speech but the government that speaks through the Governor General on that particular occasion. "A thing of beauty is a joy forever."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: I noted the pious way in which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) expressed this gift. He wishes to give members on this side a gift. He wishes to give us something we did not have before. He wants to give us several extra opposition days within a certain period of time. It really touched me to hear him describe what he was going to give us. We do not want something to be given to us. We think that the rights of Parliament are rights, not to be given to us by the gift of the government.

We think that members of the House should have certain rights—that the opposition have certain rights, and that the government, of course, have certain rights. They have the right of a majority and if they do not exercise that right with some sense and discretion and propriety, then we will have no rights on this side of the House.