

*Procedure and Organization*

debate was wrong. I remember that when we were in government we proposed to give the Minister of National Revenue power to decide by himself the classes and kinds of certain articles manufactured in Canada. The opposition debated that proposal I believe for only three weeks. I believe the opposition of that day was right. I believed it at the time, although I did not wish to admit it. The result was the Senate refused to pass that legislation, and it was never implemented. The smart thing for the government would have been to have never made such a proposal to parliament, because I believe it was wrong.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I support the amendment which is before us because its intent is to eliminate 75c. The amendment reads as follows:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend it by deleting therefrom proposed Standing Order 75c.

That amendment has been put forward in good faith, in the belief that it is a reasonable proposition. I would appeal to the government to consider the acceptance of this amendment. If they should find that unpallatable I have an even simpler suggestion by which the government could get itself and us out of this log jam. I suggest that the government just move the adjournment of this debate and then adjourn the house until October. In the meantime, the government would have an opportunity to do some thinking about this situation. There is no urgency about this rule. If we should adjourn for the summer, which I understand is the idea after this motion is passed, the rule could not be operative in any event until parliament sits again in October. There would be no parliament on which to impose it. I could see more logic in this situation if what we were involved in were legislation which would come into effect at a certain deadline during the summer, such as the business of supply or something like that. This rule, however, will be useless until we return in October. As I said, there will be nobody here to impose it. I should like the house leader and members of the government to think this over and take some advice from experienced members and others, not necessarily on this side of the house.

I suggest that the government take some advice from their own caucus. If the President of the Privy Council does not feel it appropriate to seek advice of this nature from

[Mr. MacLean.]

his own colleagues, then I wish he would ask someone for advice. I would like to feel he had at least asked his wife about the wisdom of this procedure. Then he could perhaps think it over and in the fall come back with something more sensible.

A great many comparisons have been made between the situation here and the allocation of time in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, the pressure under which parliament operates is even much greater than it is here for obvious reasons. Therefore the pressure for allocation of time is even greater. That does not mean that the allocation of time is good. It is something which should be avoided if at all possible. In the United Kingdom, however, it is more difficult to avoid, because they have a unitary system of government. Roughly speaking, the parliament of the United Kingdom deals with all the things with which we deal and many other things in addition. The Parliament of the United Kingdom deals with everything the ten legislatures in Canada deal with in the course of a year, and deals with these things in relation to more than twice the population. In addition, in the United Kingdom there are more nationalized industries.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is it agreed that the hon. member may continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. MacLean:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to the house for giving me unanimous consent. I shall wind up my remarks quickly.

I was making the point that the two situations are not comparable. Canada is a diverse country with great distances, many ethnic groups, many regions, two languages and perhaps more important than anything else so far as the population being conscious of what is happening in parliament is concerned, in Canada we do not have a truly national press. Any press which aspires to be a national press generally speaking is not even located in Ottawa, the capital city. On the other hand, in the United Kingdom there is a national press located right at the heart of parliament and anything which takes place in the House of Commons is common knowledge throughout the United Kingdom almost immediately.