

Procedure and Organization

espouses the right of free speech, is reawakened and resurrected to the extent that this invidious and insidious rule will be thrown out.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): It will not be done under this Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many minutes I have left. I would like to make three suggestions as to how we can extricate ourselves from this problem. I shall make my remarks as short as possible but I think that perhaps for the first time in my parliamentary life I will ask the indulgence of the house to enable me to complete putting forward these three ideas. I promise not to trespass outside the few notes I have in my hand.

The first suggestion is simply that 75A and 75B be accepted by the house. Some people may have a caveat or rider to attach to that. However, I suggest that those two rules be accepted by the house on a year's trial.

My second suggestion concerns what is popularly known here as the *Globe and Mail* formula. In an editorial the *Globe and Mail*—I think even before we started our deliberations—suggested that the important thing about debate was to give the country a chance to formulate its opinions and make them known to members of parliament. That newspaper suggested that, perhaps not so importantly a member of parliament should initially state those opinions, but somewhere in the parliamentary process the opinions should have a chance to be stated. I think that is a valid point. I do not claim for myself the right to rise and trumpet an opinion that somebody else has put forward, but I think the opinion should be squarely in our minds when deciding collectively what legislation should be passed. I am not a great admirer of the *Globe and Mail*. I get tired of its sending people from Toronto to Ottawa who go back and do two things.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member, but I must bring to the attention of the house that the hon. member's time has expired. He may continue only with the unanimous agreement of the house. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleagues for their courtesy and I shall conclude my remarks as quickly as possible. I get tired of the peregrinations to Ottawa of

reporters of the *Globe and Mail* because when they return to Toronto they do two things. The second thing is that they write about members of parliament receiving \$18,000 a year. And the first thing they write is their expense account. They have the right to come here and charge their expenses, but they do not think members of parliament have the right to come to Ottawa from Vancouver, Halifax, St. John's, or wherever it may be, earn this salary and be paid a travelling allowance. I realize that these people probably solve the office space problem by placing two seats in one stall. However, they write their opinions about us. Now for once in my life I recognize that they have a valid point. When looking for a better way of dealing with our business we have to put it on the most orderly basis. In this respect I am in agreement with the *Globe and Mail*. To achieve this end means obtaining outside opinion.

I present my third suggestion without having consulted anybody, but in the hope we can resolve the situation in which we find ourselves, and leave shortly for a summer recess, although some of us will not have a summer recess because we have to attend committee meetings in August and September. I suggest that the problem of allocation of time and mustering of public opinion come together not really in the House of Commons but in our committee system. I think we can find the answer there. I make this suggestion to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), the Acting Prime Minister, all hon. members and you, Mr. Speaker, as a possible solution to the problem.

I suggest that we form a backbenchers' committee of this place, say of five or six members from either side of the house. In a moment I shall suggest the formula by which they be chosen. These members should consider ways by which the committee system may be made more workable. I am a great believer in the committee system. I think I have probably sat on as many committees as anybody else. I have given the system my all. I said last night, and I firmly believe, that it was of great credit to hon. members on both sides of the house that in the year since the last election we have done our best to receive any subject referred to committee, give it our best thought, discussion and deliberation, and come up with the best answer for the people of Canada.

I still believe in that approach. Nothing in the angry words that people on this or the