

yes, and they administer the affairs of a great empire in rather short sessions of the House. Why should we be provincial in this matter? Let us imitate the great mother of parliaments; let us be broad-minded and business-like. The country would thank us for it.

New rule to be added after rule 3—adjournment at 11 o'clock—agreed to.

Rule 5—to be transferred to rule 23 as section 1, agreed to.

Amended rule 10—Select standing committees.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I observe that there is a committee on industrial relations. Our present committee is called committee on industrial and international relations. I think we should retain the two words.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a mistake; the full name will be restored as it was formerly.

Mr. NEILL: I must take exception to this rule. I do not think it will achieve the purpose intended. I think the general idea is that there is difficulty in getting a quorum together on the day on which these committees meet, and it is proposed to remedy that by reducing the size of the committees, but in many cases increasing the percentage of the quorum, which will make it even more difficult to get a quorum. To begin with, may I say that much of the difficulty in getting a quorum of committees together is due to the fact that it is the custom of hon. members living in the neighbourhood in Quebec and in nearby places in Ontario to go home for the week-ends; consequently we have no committee meetings on Friday or Saturday, and we might well have meetings on those days, and we have no committee meetings on Monday because the members have not got back, and the result is that on Tuesday morning we have seven or eight committees all asking for a quorum at eleven o'clock. That is the real trouble in getting a quorum together. Some hon. members are ashamed to advertise that fact. Look at the proposed changes in the number of members on the committees. In the case of the committee on miscellaneous private bills it is proposed to have fifty members, fifteen of whom shall constitute a quorum. The committee formerly was composed of sixty-five members, and ten would constitute a quorum. If my figuring is correct ten out of sixty-five would mean 15 per cent, and fifteen out of fifty would be 30 per cent. Do hon. members think it will be easier to get 30 per cent of the committee than it would be to get

[Mr. Speaker.]

15 per cent? The same idea is carried out all through the list of committees. The quorum for the committee on agriculture has been raised from 11 to 33 per cent. It would be comparatively easy to obtain a quorum of 11 per cent out of a membership of 105, but when you have to get 33 per cent of that committee together in order to have a quorum, it will be difficult. I say that these changes will not achieve the object aimed at. I suggest that the remedy is to leave the committee as it was before and make the quorum smaller.

I should like to refer to another phase of the matter. On page 7 we have the statement that it has been so arranged that each member may belong to two committees, according to the number of committee men arranged under this section. That will not be satisfactory in working out the matter. It may be all very well for members who represent an exclusively industrial district, or perhaps those exclusively engaged in some kind of farming, such as the growing of wheat in Alberta, but there are other districts where they are engaged in a variety of employments and where some representation should be granted to them. For instance, in the district I represent we have a large agricultural population and I want to be on the agriculture committee. Marine and fisheries is an important thing in my district, and I want to be on that committee. Then again, on account of the large labour vote in my district, I want to be on the industrial relations committee. I am told I can be placed on two committees only. Which of the two will it be? Take fisheries as an illustration; that resolves itself around two features, the salmon fishery in British Columbia and the lobster fishery on the Atlantic coast. Am I to leave the interests of the salmon fisheries in my district to be decided by the gentleman from Nova Scotia, whose interest does not go beyond the lobster industry or vice versa? It is not fair or just.

Another point is that people say "Oh well, members do not come to committee meetings." We will find that they will come to the sittings of both committees on occasions when they are required. A man interested in the dairy industry will not attend a meeting of the agriculture committee when the committee is dealing with the transportation of beef cattle across the Atlantic, but he will be on hand when the matter in which he is interested is to be discussed. When the transportation of cattle across the Atlantic is under consideration he can go to other