

mediated settlement. But our House leader also said during his remarks, as reported at page 11607 of *Hansard*:

● (0030)

I hope it is in order for me to say that I have been told there will be no closure on this motion, Mr. Speaker, and on that assumption and understanding we had said we would be supporting the government to adjourn the House.

As I said, a number of things have happened since then. First, at eight o'clock last night some 30 odd members of the Liberal Party came very quickly into the House, using some devious trickery and calling for the question to be put. This was very unfair. I think it showed the Liberal Party's lack of respect for Parliament and parliamentary traditions, something we did not expect. More important, last night at 9.45 p.m. we heard a Minister of the Crown introduce a motion for closure. For the first time in the history of Parliament we are seeing adjournment by closure. Because of that our House leader has recommended, and our caucus has supported voting against the adjournment motion at one o'clock this morning.

**An hon. Member:** You have only three members here.

**Mr. Nystrom:** I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, and I can tell from the interjections and heckling, that the Liberals have not learned to treat this institution with the respect it deserves.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nystrom:** A few years ago their leader said that once members of Parliament leave this place they become nobodies. The Liberals do not respect this institution.

We will have to reform Parliament to make it a more democratic institution in which members from all parties can have some real input into legislation. By bringing in closure the government slaps the face of this institution which is so important to the people of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Nystrom:** Because of the government's action there is no way we can support adjourning the House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, once again, I am called upon to rise before this hon. assembly, and I am always very happy to do so, especially since it is extremely important for the representatives of the Canadian people to be able to express their views in this place. Unfortunately, I am doing so under strange circumstances since, if my watch is right, today is July 18, 1981, and all the provincial legislatures have recessed and we should now be in our own constituencies speaking to our voters and meeting the people who elected us to learn about their needs and where we are going. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is always easy to try to get attention for all sorts of reasons. What I find most surprising in Parliament, where I have been for about 15 months, is that in addition to getting increasingly familiar with the system, because we learn

### *Summer Recess*

as the months go by, I am now starting to know human nature somewhat better. And the more I know about those on the other side, the more questions I have to ask myself.

When a political party defines its ideas clearly, puts them forward, follows a policy and represents the people who elected it, one may say that democracy is being respected. One may say that politicians are true politicians. I can hear the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) laughing. I shall get to him, Mr. Speaker, I shall get to the right hon. member for Yellowhead because I am very concerned about him at this time. I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to note—

[*English*]

**Mr. Paproski:** The "Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition".

**Mr. Gimaïel:** The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition who is the successor of the Right Hon. John A. Macdonald, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker and many others.

[*Translation*]

Many others, from a long line of individuals who had a sense of what they owed to their country, who led a political party to help Canadians build a country, who wanted to give individual rights to Canadians, who came here with ideas and who fought for them. I had always thought that those were the men who were chosen as leaders of national parties. But unfortunately, this evening, I must admit that the most recent choice of the Progressive Conservative Party is not from this line, and I say so after 15 months of work, with no second thought, no malice and in all honesty. Why do I say so? To try to wake some people up. Certain tactics have been used in this House which I cannot accept as a member of Parliament representing 80,000 people in the constituency of Lac-Saint-Jean.

I have witnessed a boycott aimed simply at harming an institution which is sacred throughout the country, namely the House of Commons of Canada, which is the foundation of our democracy. No attempt was made to defend ideas when it was time to speak about the Canadian Constitution. The Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition simply blocked the proceedings by points of order, questions of privilege and all sorts of tricks that had nothing to do with the future of the Canadian people and nothing to do with our country.

**Mr. Clark:** Why don't you put the question to the people of Lac-Saint-Jean?

**Mr. Gimaïel:** Now that we are having a debate, now that we shall be going back to our constituencies to see to the needs of our people, what is happening? Once again, from his lofty height, the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition tells us: Let us obstruct for all kinds of reasons! Now it is for a strike, later it will be for something else. It is simply unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, for the leader of a national party to behave in this way. It is intolerable that a man who was Prime Minister of Canada during nine months should act in such a way. We are