House. It has allowed an exchange between Members. As a result of that, it tends to make us all a little more careful about what we are saying. We have to think a little more about what we are doing. The net result, hopefully, will be, as time goes on, a higher quality debate. Those are the kinds of things the Committee was trying to address. In December we will have to make a decision on the rules that are presently in force.

I want to look at a few things that I think are needed. Some of them have been talked about by previous speakers. One I have not heard anyone mention, and which I think is important, addresses some of the concerns of the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton. I refer to the legislative timetable. It would allow Members on both sides of the House to come to grips with some of the concerns that we have as a Parliament. It would give the Opposition an opportunity to look at legislation that will be coming forward. We would know approximately when it would be coming forward. At that point we could sit down and discuss where we want to dig our heels in and what legislation we want to go through quickly.

There would be a sense of co-operation, a sense of give and take. In Britain they have that system. It is the so-called "usual channels" system. It seems to work fairly well. There is considerable agreement from all sides of the House about the legislation to go forward. We cannot write something like that into the rules, but it is something that can be brought forward with the proper attitude. I would like to see it done.

The second point I would like to see utilized in this House is the paper that has been under discussion for quite some time by various Members of the House, the Huntington-Lachance paper. It was written by these two Members on opposite sides of the House. They have done a great deal of work. They put a great deal of effort into the concerns that we have about Parliament and this institution, having a dramatic impact on the financial control of the House of Commons or the financial control of Government expenditures. That, of course, goes into all things like Crown corporations and agencies. I think it could become particularly significant and of concern to all Canadians. That is the second matter I would like to see the House deal with. Of course, we are now dealing with it in Committee. Hopefully we will have a chance to have it brought forward and the House will have the opportunity to make a decision on it.

Third, and I will not go into much detail on this because the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton spoke very clearly about it, is the whole area of legislative committees, those committees which deal with specific Bills. They are set up by a striking committee. Hopefully, there will be representation of the talent on both sides of the House in relation to a particular piece of legislation. That would have a positive effect on the way that we deal with legislation, the debate put forward on it. It could be a very positive move which this House can take.

The fourth point has become really exciting. It is very important. It would have a dramatic impact on the way that we approach our committees and quite an impact on that which is so fundamental to this House, namely, attitude. I refer, of course, to the chairmens' panel. We have heard mention of it. What it boils down to is that you have several Members from both Opposition and Governmnt who would become part of the Chairmen's panel. From that panel the Speaker would choose a chairman to be the chairman of a particular legislative committee to look at a particular piece of legislation. We could well have an Opposition Member as chairman of a particular committee. What you do is break down the partisan elements of the debate and you tend to focus on good legislation. That is something this Government, this Parliament and this House was designed to accomplish in the first place.

The fifth item is really the whole matter of attitude. That is the wide-ranging authority of this House to investigate executive action and related bodies' action, essentially anything that goes on which comes under the umbrella of the Government of the country. That is what we as Members of Parliament, no matter what Party or region we represent, were elected to do. That is the whole purpose and reason for a parliamentary government.

In conclusion I should like to say that this is an important institution. It is worth protecting and worth fighting for. We have to look very closely at the danger signals. That is why I mentioned some of them in my remarks. They are in fact dangerous signals and we should look at them. They should be flagged. We have to maintain with a vigilance the responsibility which we as elected Members have to ensure that the power of authority really does rest within this House and not within a select group of people.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct one short question to the Hon. Member regarding Wednesday afternoon. I agree with him about the importance of Private Members' Hour, but it does break the momentum of the regular business of the House. Would the Hon. Member be good enough to elaborate on this? He stated that he had discussed this with a number of people. I would like to hear their view about taking up the heart of the week in this way. Members travel on Mondays and Fridays. I feel it breaks the momentum of the business of the House to have this in the very important middle part of the week, that is, on Wednesday. Could the Hon. Member elaborate a little more on that? He said that Private Members' business on Wednesday was the best solution and that it was the best time. I would like to hear his comments on how it affects the continuity of the business of the House, being in the middle of the week, and his comments on having Private Members' Hour on either Monday or Friday. I support him in the fact that Private Members' business is a very important element of the proceedings of this House.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. It is a legitimate one. I was not a Member of the Committee when the decision was made, but I know from discussions with Members on both sides of the House who were members of the Committee and Members at large that the reason for having it on Wednesday, as I mentioned earlier, was to raise the profile. In other words, putting it in the middle of the week would