

*Conduct of House Business*

Mr. Chairman, we have been sitting since February 1964. We did not even have holidays last summer and God knows if we will have any this year. Now the government is submitting amendments to standing orders under the pretext that sessions would be considerably shortened.

If, for example, the government provided in its proposals that sessions would open about September 10 and adjourn on December 20, to resume afterwards on January 10 till June 30, it seems to me that in the meantime the government could prepare the legislation to be submitted for the consideration of the house.

However, the government did not see fit to set the dates for the opening and adjournment of sessions.

I also wish to deal with another point, namely the planning of business and parliamentary procedure. We all know, including the Liberals and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. McIlraith), that it takes the government a long time to prepare and introduce its pieces of legislation. Once they are prepared, we are presented with ready-made measures about which no member knows anything. As a matter of fact, some bills are not even printed when we start discussing them. In my opinion, such a situation is intolerable within a so-called democratic parliament. The government could improve the procedure by introducing its measures so as to make us more familiar with their purpose.

Another thing which is quite a waste of time for the house and the public in general is the notorious motions of non-confidence. As soon as the government is dissatisfied a non-confidence vote is called. It is a foregone conclusion that the government's followers will vote with the government, even if that does not suit them, and that the followers of the Leader of the Opposition will vote with him. Therefore, the government should have taken into account in the proposed amendments to the rules these non-confidence votes which are a waste of time.

Mr. Chairman, paragraph 2 of section 1 of resolution No. 15 provides among other things that:

—if ten or more members then rise, the question shall not be put on the motion. If no member objects or if fewer than ten members rise in their places, the motion shall be deemed to be carried.

As the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) rightly stated earlier, such provision takes away the right of the minority parties,

the small political parties, to appeal against a ruling of the Speaker.

I heard earlier the hon. member for Fraser-Valley (Mr. Patterson) state that we should always maintain the Speaker's ruling. I understand that there are only nine members in his group and since at least ten members would have to rise and ask to be recognized by the Chair, his group could never be recognized since they are only nine members.

But as far as groups with more than ten members are concerned, if some of their members were absent because of illness, because they were delegated somewhere or for some other reason, then those groups could not appeal from the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Chairman, I think that figure of ten should be cut down to five so that the Chair would have to recognize only five members when they rise.

I think that figure 10 should be lowered to 5.

Mr. Chairman, paragraph 2 of Order No. 15 reads as follows:

That Section (1) of standing order 12 be amended to read as follows:

*Standing order 12, section (1)*

12. (1) Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum—

Ever since Canada came into existence and ever since the House of Commons was established, always, in all circumstances, Mr. Speaker has had to face opposition, sometimes from his left and sometimes from his right, with regard to one of his rulings made and, then, I think it has been established that an appeal from such a ruling is but a process of democracy.

We have no doubts that the Speaker is a perfect gentleman but sometimes, when we say something that he rules out of order, we have the right to appeal from his ruling. This is the point involved in the amendment of the hon. member from Lapointe. We shall support this amendment, and I hope the President of the Privy Council will understand that we are not casting doubt on the Speaker's impartiality, good faith or good will, but merely recognizing a democratic principle of the Canadian parliament, namely that which allows the opposition, or even the government, to appeal the Speaker's decision when any group in the House wishes.

Therefore, section 12 of the Standing Orders is amended to read:

No debate shall be permitted—

We agree that no debate should be permitted, but we do not agree that there should be no appeal against the Speaker's ruling,