

independents who come here from time to time, shall no longer have a voice by refusing unanimous consent and enforcing their veto in that way.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would the hon. member try again to answer my second question? Is it not a fact that under our system the government is responsible to parliament?

Mr. Reid: Yes, the government is responsible to parliament as long as it maintains the support of the House of Commons, which in practical terms in the House of Commons means the support of its own backbenchers if it be a majority, and the support of members in opposition if it be a minority. But as I said I do not think we were elected as individual members of parliament. The brutal fact is that we came here as members of political parties, and we shall live or die on the hustings as our parties perform.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE
DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office Department—Vancouver—Dissatisfaction of letter carriers with five day delivery; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)—Unemployment Insurance—government policy respecting modification of operation; the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner)—Water Resources—diversion of waters from Hudson and James Bays.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

EXTENSION OF POWERS OF SPECIAL
COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): On a question of order, Mr. Speaker, and before the next member rises to his feet I wonder if we could have permission to revert to motions to attempt to pass the order again which has been so much desired by members of all parties serving on the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments?

Procedure and Organization

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, this motion was proposed yesterday by the minister and we did not agree merely because we did not have time for consultation and had not been notified. There is no objection at this time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): There is no objection here, either. This is another of those examples of what can be done by consultation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as to the question of non-notification I would point out that the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) insisted that this order be moved yesterday, and again today. If there is general agreement perhaps the following could be made an order of the house:

That the powers of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, appointed by order of the house on September 30, 1968, be extended by adding the following powers:

To consider and, from time to time, to report on the adequacy of existing statutory authority for the making and publication of statutory instruments and on the adequacy of existing procedures for the drafting, scrutiny, and operational review of such instruments, and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT
OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Blair that the third report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, presented to the house on Friday, June 20, 1969, be concurred in, and on the amendment thereto of Mr. Baldwin (p. 10963).

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, which in my opinion centres around rule 75c, I find it most easy to support the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the report be referred back to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I believe all reasonable and intelligent members realize that if there is to be a reasonable attempt at co-operation in the house this report must be referred back to the committee, particularly since debate has centred around one portion of it. Having referred it back, surely reasonable men could reasonably