

*Standing Orders*

traditions, I believe all Hon. Members have a certain responsibility as we sit in the House. If we abdicate that responsibility, we have to understand what we are doing. We have to appreciate the fact that the rest of the House will not accept it. I believe that five days is very conservative. I suggest that five days should be the minimum length of time, certainly for a second offence, if we can call it that, to the rest of the House. So if the question is whether I support the rejection of an Hon. Member for five days, indeed, I do.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member could clarify. I think he is trying to make the point that the House in fact makes a decision with respect to the behaviour of individual Hon. Members. Does he feel the expulsion should be made by the House or by Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Jardine:** Mr. Speaker, great trust is put in the wisdom of the Speaker. The Speaker is elected by Hon. Members on all sides of the House. In placing that trust, I believe we have to give the Speaker more responsibility in order to enforce these few rules. They are not at all too restrictive, by any means. Yes, the Speaker should have the authority.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, I just have a comment. I appreciate where the Hon. Member is coming from. I share her concern to some extent. I would just like to tell her and the House that up until a few years ago, it was relatively rare for an Hon. Member to be named and ejected from the House. Indeed, I recall that during the nine years of the speakership of Speaker Lamoureux there was not one Hon. Member named. I would like to see the House get back to that system of decorum. If we do, we will have no concern about this new power we give to the Speaker.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member suggested that because we are electing the Speaker, this particular new measure will in fact be workable. I wonder if he would then support the position that the election of the Speaker should be carried out at the same time as the introduction of this particular measure?

**Mr. Jardine:** Mr. Speaker, all things happen in due course and I do not believe there is any need to push one before the other. I think it is a case of letting us walk before we start running.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I have another question as it relates to the issue of the newly vested powers in committee with respect to reviewing Order in Council appointments. I wonder if the Hon. Member supports the position taken by the McGrath Committee in this regard or whether in fact he supports the position as presented by the Government?

**Mr. Jardine:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for all of these good questions because it gives me an opportunity to stand up and be recognized. I have such faith in the Chairman of this reform committee that, indeed, I support all of his recommendations.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member supports the recommendations of the McGrath committee, as I do with respect to this particular measure, I think he should be aware of the fact that the McGrath committee suggested not only that the committee be given the power to review Order in Council appointments but that there be vested in that committee the power of veto. I wonder if he believes in fact that that power should be vested in ordinary Hon. Members? If he does so believe, why then is he supporting the current legislation which does not make a provision for such a veto?

**Mr. Jardine:** Mr. Speaker, I must say I am not sure I got the gist of the question. I do not know whether the Hon. Member would want to repeat it to me.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, basically, the question is that the McGrath committee made a recommendation that ordinary Hon. Members be given not only the power to review Order in Council appointments but, if they find an appointment that is not a worthy one, they have the power of veto. In the motion before us, the committee is being given the power of review, and it may review all of the appointments in the world but it cannot really do anything about them. So the second aspect of the McGrath Report, which was to give ordinary Hon. Members of Parliament some power, has been nullified because we only have the power of review. It can be the absolutely worst appointment in the world and we can talk about it but we cannot do anything. That is why I would have preferred to see the actual report implemented as suggested by the able Chairman.

**Mr. Jardine:** Mr. Speaker, your hon. colleague made the comment about a "paper tiger". I do not really think it is a paper tiger. The committee can review all appointments. If there is a particular appointment about which the committee feels very strongly, I believe it would be listened to by the Government.

**Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this motion. It is the culmination of a very long process. A lot of thought and care has gone into it from Hon. Members on all sides of the House.

Such criticisms as I have are minor. They are with respect to matters which I am sure can be resolved with some work and good faith on the part of everyone. I was here when the talk of reform began. It was at the time when Mr. Baldwin was the House Leader for the Conservatives and Mitchell Sharp was our House Leader. At that time the reform foundered on the rocks of control of supply. The issue then seemed to have collapsed for a while but has now been picked up again and I think the proposals we have before us are really very progressive and should, indeed, enhance the role of the private Member.

The occasions in the House when we think and talk as one Canadian to another on matters which are of importance to all of us are rare, but they are very welcome. We were all elected to work for the public good and all of us do that in so far as we can. The Parties have different policies and viewpoints. In fact,