# December 10, 1968

through. All of us holding the position of hour. The one hour on the report stage will house leader will have to know pretty well the thinking among the members of our parties, and we will have to do some arguing with the members of our parties as to the things we think should be agreed to. We are prepared to accept that responsibility but, Mr. Speaker, that is the way parliament ought to be run, by all of our members through their representations, the house leaders, accepting the responsibility of organizing the work of parliament. Parliament should not be run by one man supported by a majority over there saying how things should be done.

The Leader of the Opposition made a reference to the fact that assurances might be given that this rule would not be used in its extreme. I am afraid these assurances will not have any value so far as I am concerned. You see, Mr. Speaker, during the course of our committee proceedings a proposal that was made at one time was that all second reading debates be limited to one day, and at another time the proposal was made that all third readings be decided without any debate. When you have people with that frame of mind toward parliament you do not put a rule like this in their hands.

# Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): One of these days a complicated, omnibus bill will be coming forward from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). Under the new rules it would have a second reading debate, go to a standing committee, and come back to the house for a report stage debate and third reading. It is a contentious bill and you know, Mr. Speaker, that lots of things can happen. I imagine that at the report stage of that bill there may be 40 amendments for Your Honour to sort out, select, and so on. Let us say that the government house leader thinks that too much of this sin called debate is going to take place. I am going to the extreme, Mr. Speaker. I am going to the reductio ad absurdum, but it can happen with this government. He can bring in one of these unanimous reports if he has met alone, or in the event that the rest of us are not in agreement with him, and then we can have a two hours debate on his recommendation. He recommends a one day debate on second reading of this omnibus bill and that it go to committee, that the committee have two days or three days, that the report stage last for one hour, and that third reading take half an standing order 39A, to inform the house that 29180-239

## COMMONS DEBATES

# Motion for Concurrence in Report

save Your Honour the problem of sorting out the 40 amendments.

I know I have stated this in ridiculous terms, but that is possible under this proposed rule, and in that same motion based on his unanimous recommendation the government house leader could make proposals for every other item appearing on the order paper.

I do not suppose we will get to this omnibus bill until after the Christmas recess. if we have a Christmas recess, but by that time there may be a measure on the order paper to sell Air Canada to C.P.A., and that could be covered in the government house leader's motion, giving us no real opportunity to fight it. By that time the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) may have completed his review of social legislation and we may have legislation on the order paper concerning old age security and family allowances. These can be included in the government house leader's motion also, and all we have is the right to debate it for two hours, with speeches limited to 20 minutes, and then the vote is put.

This is a rule that we cannot stand for. I hope that the government will listen to reason and will agree that it has to be changed. We do not enter this debate with any desire to keep it going forever and ever, to prevent our getting out of here for Christmas week and that sort of thing. We are not starting a filibuster. We are not daring the government to bring on closure. We are making this protest because we believe debate in parliament is valid, and if we can make our case for the deletion of the proposed standing order 16-A, or its improvement, we hope the government will give consideration to it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we in this party support the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I have some suggestions I want to make about standing order 16-A as to ways in which improvements can be made, but perhaps I can keep Your Honour guessing until eight o'clock as to what those suggestions are.

#### [Translation]

### **PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT** MOTION

#### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to