

Report of Special Committee

order to which I referred has, in effect, boxed us into a time frame, in any event. I am not advocating that we ought to wait until the midnight hour, until December 21. However, we are bickering over whether we will do it on October 14 or some time subsequent, but before December 21. That is what we are arguing over.

After putting 16 months into this exercise, we are now here for a full day bickering about whether we should do it today, next week, or maybe the week after, or sometime, hopefully, very soon. We must do it, in conscience. If we believe what we instructed the committee to do in the first place 16 months ago, in conscience we must have something to supplant, to take over, when the interim arrangement runs out on December 21. That is common sense. It would be a betrayal of the House if we did not do something, put in place an adequate replacement for the interim rules that are now operative in this Chamber.

Therefore, I make a plea to those who support the motion, because I can support the spirit of the motion. I can support it in the sense that we would like to have the concurrence of this House in this report. I would seek the indulgence of those who say it must be done today. I would ask them to stand back a moment and think about what damage they may be doing to the over-all process, because surely the over-all process, the over-all objective, is to get as much as possible of the package which the committee has produced over 16 months embodied in the new rules of the House.

I say to Your Honour that the most hopeful way, the best way of doing that, is to allow Members of the House an opportunity to deliberate on the implication, not an unduly long opportunity. However, when I hear Hon. Members of the House who are not members of the committee standing in their place and pleading with the House, in effect, "Give us a little time so we know what it is we are getting ourselves into", I think that is a fair request and one which ought to be heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are Hon. Members rising to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of this House so that the debate on this motion be merely adjourned—

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Pinard:—and that we proceed to the Orders of the Day so that we can resume debate forthwith on Bill C-155. I can assure Your Honour that you will receive this consent from the Government side of the House.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, when this business began today, I was quite frankly hoping that the Government would have reflected on its rejection last night, yesterday, of the reports. Now we are dealing with this particular report, it would reflect upon the rejection of this simple report. We are not prepared to consent to a process that would eliminate the possibility of agreement today with respect to this very small but very important adjunct to the third report of the committee. That is why it is there. Therefore, the simple

answer to my friend's request is no, there is no unanimous consent.

● (1450)

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, normally I would say that I am pleased to participate in a debate, but I would be less than honest if I made that particular statement today because I frankly feel that this debate is inappropriate at this particular time, given the approximately 16 months of splendid work done by the special committee which was established by this House in order to find ways in which we can make Parliament more relevant and the work of the individual Member of Parliament more relevant.

I wish to join with the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) in paying tribute to the Chairman of that committee, the Hon. Member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle (Mr. Lefebvre). I am sure all Hon. Members agree that he handled his assignments in an able, direct and non-partisan fashion. We also saw fit to name two vice-chairmen, one of whom is the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton. When he was called upon to fulfil that particular responsibility, he worked admirably and in a way as commendable as that of the Hon. Member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle.

The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), who is the House Leader for the New Democratic Party, was also named as a vice-chairman. Due to the fact that there are few of them and the other responsibilities given to that Member, I understand that that task was subsequently taken over from time to time by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) and the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant), particularly during the latter portion of the committee hearings when they saw fit to attend each and every meeting. This shows that there was a positive response not only from every Member on the committee but every Party in the House on a strictly non-partisan basis.

This was an enjoyable committee because our work was worth-while. Our hearings were conducted in a wonderful atmosphere. Let me give an example of the importance we gave to the committee and the sense of humour which made it enjoyable. We had a rather long debate about whether we should go to Mont Ste.-Marie for a day or two to work full-time on a particular report, to Montebello or to remain here in Ottawa. The feeling was that Mont Ste.-Marie would be the choice. Unfortunately, one of the members of the committee left the meeting before we finally made our decision, although he was the one who emphasized that if we were going to Mont Ste.-Marie we should be there to begin work at 9:30. When it came to 9:30, this particular Member did not show up. As a matter of fact he did not show up until approximately one o'clock in the afternoon. We had determined that instead of leaving for Mont Ste.-Marie he had gone to Montebello and therefore had to find his way to Mont Ste.-Marie from there. We will not mention his name because it is with a sense of humour that we are not letting that individual forget that he went to the wrong place. We certainly