

House of Commons Procedures

forward by Mr. McGee of appointing a Member for Parliament Hill or the idea the British are thinking about that the Speaker should be the Member for St. Stephen's, the impression will be gradually created that the Speakership is some kind of Civil Service appointment. If we start with an elected Member and follow a similar course, the same difficulty will arise sooner or later. The present system has served us well despite what may have been done in 1956. One of the meanest things about the way in which the argument has developed about a permanent Speakership is that it has forced the passing of opinions about Speakers we have had, and by the very absence of reference to the Speaker in the last Parliament, the hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), a disservice has been done both to the office and to that hon. gentleman.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) introduced the notion of televising our debates here and putting them on radio. He acknowledged that this represented a change or development in his attitude. I remember that on other occasions when this question was being argued in this Chamber there was very little support for it from the party which the right hon. gentleman leads. I hope this suggestion will be taken up by the Government and at least given consideration. Maybe it could become part of the new politics. If we cannot have the Pearson film, possibly we can have the hon. gentleman on television "live" from the House of Commons. My conclusion is this: I hope the Government will decide to go ahead and get this measure out of the way by Friday. I have an understanding that this is likely and I hope it will be done by agreement.

● (8:20 p.m.)

But if agreement is not possible I suggest that one of the things that is part of the responsibility of leading the Government is to take a very strong initiative. All I can suggest is that if the Government is not prepared to take the initiative to get these resolutions through it is jettisoning the responsibility that arises in this Chamber with regard to the very resolutions that we have before us.

Mr. Moreau: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Member permit another question? I did not want to interrupt the hon. Member for a second time during his remarks but I did not quite get the point he was making concerning the allocation of time. Am I to un-

derstand that he is now somewhat hesitant about accepting the allocation of time, contrary to the statement which was issued by the leader of his party in a press communiqué last September?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, we accept the allocation of time but we do not accept the argument put forward by Government backbenchers that this is automatically going to mean that 50 per cent of that time will go to Government spokesmen.

Mr. Moreau: When have we ever had 50 per cent of the time?

Mr. Fisher: No one has ever said you have had it. That is what I was talking about, the tradition. Just let us not get the idea accepted or believed that this is going to be one of the consequences of the reform.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Batten): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, I think the Government House Leader may wish to make some announcement to the House at this point before any question is put.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the discussion that took place on Orders of the Day today a meeting of the House leaders has been held. I had hoped that at this moment I would be able to announce that agreement was unanimous but I am not able to do that, not quite, if I may use a limiting qualification. But the points on which we seemed to be in almost unanimous agreement were these: that the proposed amendment to Order No. 14 now before the House would be withdrawn; that paragraph No. 2 of Order No. 14 would be referred to a special committee, to be established later today, for consideration and report back to the House by 11 a.m. on Friday, June 11, 1965; that the report of that committee would be disposed of by the House by 5 p.m. on that day; that the balance of Order No. 14 would be adopted today; that if Order No. 15 was not disposed of by 10 p.m. on Thursday night, June 10, it would be taken up after the committee report on the proposed Standing Order 15A had been disposed of on Friday, and in any event the necessary votes to dispose of both orders, Order No. 14 and Order No. 15, would be completed on Friday at five o'clock, that is to say, all votes required to complete the whole of the two orders.