

House of Commons Procedures

discussion of the rules, regulations and procedures of the House.

I had not intended to take any part in the discussion on the proposed rule changes, as I am quite satisfied with their content and import, but I take my cue from the Prime Minister who, speaking in the House on Tuesday last, said he was speaking on an amendment to the resolution before the House and pointed out it gave him an opportunity to speak, and so dwell at some length on matters not strictly within the ambit of the amendment.

This clause of the resolution will undoubtedly limit the raising of questions of privilege in future, and remembering what the hon. Member for Saint John-Albert said this afternoon when he stated he was asking a question because hereafter the time might be cut so short that he would not be able to, I am rising on a question of privilege as the opportunity to do so will be somewhat curtailed by clause 6, with which I am in hearty accord.

On May 28 I asked a question in the House, and in it I stated a personal conviction. I asked the Minister of Justice if his department or the Cabinet:

—have ever given consideration to making it illegal for mass communication media to mention names of accused before they are convicted. Personally I do not believe they should be mentioned by name until a conviction has been registered.

I asked the Minister had any consideration been given to such fair treatment, and in his reply, a very sane and solid reply, the Minister remarked:

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that this...is one of the questions which I have under very serious consideration.

Immediately some people rose in the House and began to pillory the Minister as though this were a terrible statement for him to make, and the press of the country immediately picked it up and started to scream that the freedom of the press was being invaded—call out the army, call out the navy, call out the air force—freedom of the press was being attacked.

The Minister had given a straightforward answer and went on to say:

—there is also such a thing as respect for the freedom of the individual and in the case of juveniles the regulation already exists in the Criminal Code that their names must not be disclosed in the papers. Surely this is not an interference with the freedom of the press.

On Tuesday last the hon. Member for Prince Albert, who gave a worth-while speech

with regard to the function of parliament and its effectiveness, took occasion to wander afield and made direct reference to the suggestion I had made in the course of my question. At one point he said, and I quote from page 2106:

All over this country a howl went up. I was shocked by the suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that I was not sent here by the electors of York-Humber in order not to shock the hon. Member for Prince Albert.

May I call it ten o'clock?

Mr. McIlraith: Before it is called ten o'clock I wonder if I might put on record the amendments to the various clauses?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McIlraith: I move that section 2—

Mr. Churchill: You mean you intend to move the amendments now?

The Chairman: Order. Is the Minister simply reading the amendments for the purpose of the record at this time?

Mr. McIlraith: My understanding is that technically they could all be moved because it is only one resolution. I thought it would be desirable if Members had them all, but if I merely read them they will not appear in *Votes and Proceedings* tomorrow.

Mr. Knowles: Amendments made in committee do not go in *Votes and Proceedings* anyway.

Mr. Churchill: Put them in *Hansard*.

● (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: Yes; but I do not want to recede from the position, which is the correct one, that there is one resolution before the Committee at this time, and we agreed to discuss it paragraph by paragraph and have proceeded in that way. I think that was the reasonable, correct and satisfactory way for the House to deal with this resolution.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone is arguing about the point the President of the Privy Council is now making. But is it not a fact that if he has two, three or four amendments to make, they may be all amendments to one resolution but he cannot move them all at once? He has to move one amendment, get it carried and then move another. That is the reason I suggest he simply read them.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I can put them all into one amendment quite easily,