

other Members in the House have worked so hard to build over the last five years will be seriously damaged by this.

It did not have to be the way. It is this way partly because the Government sought to mix agendas which should not have been mixed. The purpose of extending the date for the expiry of the provisional orders past April of this year was that House Leaders would have time to consider the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedure with respect to the provisional Standing Orders. I got up in the House and said that and the Government House Leader (Mr. Lewis) got up and agreed with me.

That which is before us now at the time of the expiry of the additional period for the provisional Standing Orders is not a negotiated response only to the Standing Orders. The Government has thrown in a couple of other things which it did not like. That is fair enough. It is okay for the Government to perceive problems in the Standing Orders, but it should not have tried to deal with them in the same context as it would deal with the provisional orders.

If the Government had concerns about the use of Routine Proceedings to prevent it from moving time allocation or to prevent it from introducing Bills, that could have been dealt with separately.

The Government has very seriously risked poisoning the whole matter of parliamentary reform by injecting into a process which should have concerned itself only with the provisional Standing Orders the poison of having to deal with technical matters, *vis-a-vis* Government and Opposition, which would have been better dealt with separately. The Opposition as well perceives problems with the way in which things work in Parliament and it would have been far better to have dealt with that separately than to slip into a process which otherwise dealt with the provisional Standing Orders and reform the matters with respect to Routine Proceedings which they have.

I am very, very critical of the Government for doing that. The Government did not have to mix those two agendas, but it has and we now have to find our way out of it if we can. I hope that will be possible. In the meantime I would like to comment on some of the things which are in the motion.

Yesterday I said how concerned I was about the Government's refusal to accept the unanimous recommendation of the Lefebvre Committee, the McGrath Committee and the Standing Committee on Elections, Privileges and Procedures with regard to the procedure for the nomination of the Speaker. All three of those committees rejected the notion that people should actively have to place their name for nomination for Speaker. Yet the Government decided that it knew better than those three committees. I am told that the Government is reconsidering that. I said a lot more about this yesterday and I recommend that those who are interested in the longer argument read what I said yesterday in *Hansard* because there are other things I want to talk about today.

Standing Orders

For instance, I want to talk about the parliamentary calendar. It was a great achievement in 1982-83 when the Government and Opposition agreed to have a parliamentary calendar. Yet the Government is now proposing to include in the Standing Orders a motion through which it could very easily carry the sitting of Parliament past the June 30 adjournment date on into July. Government Members should look very carefully at what their own leadership is doing to them if they value the parliamentary calendar. As sure as I am standing here, if the parliamentary calendar is thrown away once it will be gone right out the window. If the Government is allowed, for whatever reason, to extend, through an ordinary motion—time allocation nonetheless—the sitting of this House into July as is suggested in the motion we are now debating, every Government from now until doomsday will do that.

The Government's reason for wanting to do that is that it has more business to do, that it does not have everything done which it wanted to do. That is tough. The Government has had ten months and if it cannot get the business of the House done in ten months with a 210-seat majority, that is not the problem of the parliamentary calendar or the small Opposition, but the problem of the Government. It should not be blamed on the parliamentary calendar.

● (1550)

If there is a significant and important, nationally compelling reason why Parliament ought to be recalled after the end of June, that provision already exists in the Standing Orders. All the Government has to do is justify to the Chair why Parliament ought to be recalled. The motion before us now constitutes a lack of confidence in the Speaker. The Government is saying through this motion, "we do not trust the Speaker to do what we would want the Speaker to do if we decide we want Parliament back". What is at the heart of the reform is to give more independent power to the Speaker and, through him, to the House of Commons, but what we have here is a move to remove powers from the Speaker.

I am trying to put my remarks in the context of reform. We are looking for ways, and there are many of them in this motion, which subtly, symbolically and substantively undermine the principles of the reform which has been going on for the last five years.

People may think that the proposal that the Government can extend the sittings into July only violates the parliamentary calendar part of the reform, but it also violates the notion of the Speaker as the person to whom the Government must appeal if it feels it has a good reason for recalling Parliament outside the limits of the parliamentary calendar.

There is a contradiction as well. On the one hand, the Government wants to take power away from the Speaker with respect to whether or not the House can sit in the summer and, on the other hand, it wants to give more power to the Speaker with respect to the determination of emergency debates so that the House cannot overrule the Speaker. I wish the Government would make up its mind. On the one hand it is removing the