

choose the speakers whom they desire to have heard, representing their particular party. I think that would be more desirable than to have a written rule in our procedure which would allow the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition to speak for an unlimited time.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Would the hon. gentleman be willing to comply with the decision of the whips if they decided he should not speak?

Mr. HEAPS: I would be no more willing to comply with such a decision than would the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I can quite frankly say I would not be willing to do so, and I am asking if my hon. friend would.

Mr. HEAPS: I would object to it, and that is why I am objecting to the limitation of speeches to forty minutes; in my remarks in this House I think I have only once exceeded that period. If time is being wasted in this House and if speeches are being prolonged, the government have a remedy in their hands, and I would suggest to the government and to the committee which framed these regulations that the British precedent be followed, and closure be moved.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. HEAPS: We would be following British precedent, and after closure is moved the speeches would be limited to twenty minutes.

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. member think it would be fair to allow those who spoke in the first few days to continue for three or four hours, and to limit those who speak at the last to twenty minutes? Would it not be more fair to limit everyone to forty minutes, and make everyone equal?

Mr. HEAPS: That may sound very nice in theory but it works out differently in practice. Every member of this House does not speak on every question, but any member who does desire to speak should have the right to take more than forty minutes. I think we should follow the practice of the British House of Commons and let the whips agree on a certain definite time for which the discussion will last. As one of the members of this House, Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to get rid of the budget debate in one week, and I would be satisfied to see the speech from the throne finished in the same length of time.

Mr. McGIBBON: How much of that time would the hon. member want?

Mr. HEAPS: I did not catch the remark of the hon. member, and perhaps it is as well

I did not; I do not suppose I missed very much. I think it would be well if we limited the time of discussion by arrangement; this might apply to what I believe are the two main questions which take up the time of the House, that is, the budget and the speech from the throne. On other questions I do not think lengthy speeches have been made; they have been rather brief and to the point. Personally I think that by fixing forty minutes as the time limit for speeches we are assuming a certain amount of control over the private members of this House and giving certain privileges to favoured members. I feel inclined to oppose the resolution in its entirety.

Mr. POULIOT: Will the hon. member be good enough to define what he means by a waste of time in speeches necessitating in his opinion the application of closure?

Mr. HEAPS: I certainly can do that. I hear such speeches in this House on Wednesday afternoons.

Mr. YOUNG (Saskatoon): I am very strongly opposed to long speeches and I am also very strongly opposed to this rule. I believe it is taking away from private members a privilege which should be preserved to them. Very often a member cannot say in forty minutes what he desires to say. But the difficulty is that there is so much repetition on various questions. That is where the time of the House is lost. I have noticed when estimates are going through that the most trivial questions are asked and time is taken up by the hour—all of course, for the purpose of creating political propaganda. If we had a process of education along common sense lines in this House such a rule would not be necessary. If the sense of the House on this question was so strong that it would be recognized by every member such a rule would not be necessary. I for one offer my protest as a private member to the limiting of debate in this House.

Mr. NEILL: I realize from the way in which the House received the remarks of the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) that I am essaying an unpopular task. Nevertheless I join with him in opposing this rule. I consider it of such great importance that I propose to oppose it by every possible means I can so that it shall not be said hereafter that I at any rate was a party to the adoption of this rule. My hon. friend who has just sat down objected to it on the ground that it was taking away their privileges and rights from private members. The rule goes further than