

the Senate and House of Commons Act and provisions of other acts relating to the internal management of the House of Commons' affairs; and to recommend such amendments thereto as the committee may deem advisable; with power to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses and to report from time to time.

He said: As some hon. members have indicated by what they have already said, it is apparent that this particular resolution bears an immediate relation to the one that has just been passed. The proposal is that a committee of the house should be appointed to consider matters of procedure looking to a more expeditious dispatch of public business and to such changes as may be desirable therein. In other words, while the house has just passed a resolution giving the government the right of way with regard to government business to the fullest extent that could be desired, and to that degree may appear to be depriving hon. members in part of some of their rights, the proposal is that that whole situation will be reviewed by a committee of the house composed of members of the different parties, who will be free to bring back to the house recommendations which in their opinion are essential for the preservation of the rights of private members or for the purpose of making still more secure the position of the government with respect to expediting public business.

I do not think I need say more on this resolution except to observe that, as it stands at the moment, it does not mention the names of those who will compose the committee. If the resolution carries, however, I am advised that there can be no exception to the Prime Minister announcing later on the names that have been agreed upon. The resolution having carried, it will be assumed that the house will be agreeable to the names decided upon after conference between the whips. I believe it is better not to insert the names immediately as not to do so will afford fuller opportunity for careful consideration and conference in the selection of the personnel.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question but I should not like to be debarred from saying something on the resolution later on, although I do not intend to discuss the matter at present. Has not the government in mind something concrete which it proposes to lay before the committee, and if so what is it? I ask that question in order that we may know the reason for setting up the committee. Personally I have not heard a demand for such a committee to be set up, and I would ask the Prime Minister to be good enough, if he feels so disposed, to inform

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

the house what the government has in mind, or what has actuated him in making the suggestion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The sole motive of the government in making the suggestion is to gain an opportunity to expedite the business of the house. The kind of questions that would be considered by this committee might be, for example, to provide for presenting non-money bills without notice and passing them through the three stages the same day. I do not say that would be a question which the committee, if appointed, would agree upon immediately, but they might consider whether it would not be one means of helping to expedite the business of the house. Another matter which would require consideration would be that of giving government business precedence at an earlier date; in other words, a reexamination of the resolution which has just been passed.

Another question might be that of limiting the number and kind of questions to be placed on the order paper. My hon. friend is an old parliamentarian and he has no doubt seen the order paper frequently filled with questions many of which might be asked in the course of discussion in committee of supply, questions that mostly serve to clog the order paper, and help to protract the proceedings of the house. My hon. friend, I am sure, has also seen the order paper clogged with innumerable resolutions often making it impossible for the most important resolutions to be dealt with before others much less important are reached. There might be adopted measures similar to those at Westminster with respect to resolutions, whereby a better method might be found of deciding which of them should have precedence, how many should be taken up, and so on.

Again, there is the question of appeals from decisions of the Speaker. There has grown up in the last few parliaments a practice of appealing from decisions of the Speaker, made with such frequency that it seems at times to make the rule of respecting the Speaker's ruling the exception rather than the practice. That is putting it a little strong, but the committee might well consider whether the practice of appealing from decisions of the Speaker, unless there is a very special reason for so doing, might not be restricted in some way.

Then, again, there is the right of ministers to amend their own motions. It is a very small matter, but I have seen considerable delay created in the house when a minister who has a measure before the house has to turn and find one of his colleagues to propose