

*Standing Orders*

some discussions, and rightly so, by the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Drew) for the simple reason that the leader of the official opposition, no matter what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre may think, has more responsibility than the average member of parliament. The same principle applies just as forcibly, if not more so, to the ministers of the crown and particularly the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) because after all they have the responsibility of bringing legislation before parliament. They have the responsibility of presenting it in a forceful and clear way and of presenting it in a manner that will be understood by every member of the House of Commons with all the necessary details. That is why I do not like that kind of reflection and comparisons are generally odious. I do not like the insinuation that ministers of the crown have been taking more time than they should have. I for one have been here for many years and I have never found a case under any conditions or circumstances where I felt that I had the responsibility on my shoulders that a minister of the cabinet has on his, and subject to criticism if their statements were not fully and clearly presented.

I also listened very attentively this afternoon to the speech of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), who was very active on the rules committee last year. In his remarks I thought he showed good judgment, as he does in all instances; but there was one thing with which I do not agree. He almost regretted that he did not read his speech this afternoon. Let me tell the hon. member that while his remarks may not read so well in *Hansard*, while the phraseology may not be just as chiselled as he would like, his personality with vibrancy was brought to us this afternoon; his eloquence was displayed once again. That is something you cannot put in print; yet it was felt in this parliament and in the galleries. So on that score alone I believe the house will gain a great deal if speeches are not read. The hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Gauthier) thinks the reading of speeches is a good thing for the house. My view is that this House of Commons is becoming more and more like a conference or a reading room; and that was never the intention that it should be so. I know my own constituency sent me here and after receiving their directive and after having been in contact with them for many years, and they want me to express their sentiments as I understand them, no matter how bad my delivery may be or how poor my English pronunciation.

Another practice in this house which I think is deplorable, and which has come into

[Mr. Bradette.]

being only in the last thirty years, is the quoting of citations from newspapers, editorials and periodicals. It almost seems that some hon. members are not able to put two words together unless they have a quotation to help them. This is not parliamentarianism; they are not expressing their own sentiments. I think it would help shorten the sessions if all members would try to express their own ideas, as I know they want to, and express themselves in a very practical way, which they can always easily do.

When I make that statement I have in mind one of my dear colleagues from northern Ontario, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Little), who is ill at the present time and for whom we all hope a speedy recovery. In all the years this fine man has been in the House of Commons he has not spoken more than half a dozen times, and never more than five or ten minutes at a time. But his speeches were right to the point; they were logical, and were appreciated not only by members of this house but by his own constituents, and he gave all his time and talents to his duties as an M.P. That is the kind of parliamentarianism my electors at least expect from me, and that is what is expected from all of us.

So I do not believe members should be allowed to read their speeches; and when I say that, Mr. Speaker, I mean no reflection upon you, for I believe you have done a wonderful job if any Speaker ever has. A member may have been helped in preparing his speech, but he should make a point of giving it in his own language; he will give a better speech. I remember one occasion when two very good members had well written speeches which I do not believe they took time to analyse or scrutinize. The first thing they knew they were saying some things in this house they never intended to say and for that reason alone they were defeated at the next election. These are things which are worth considering by a member of parliament.

As far as I am concerned I hope and pray that rule will be implicitly obeyed; and that is quite possible. I do not say the Prime Minister or the members of the cabinet or the leader of the opposition or those who speak for them should not be allowed to prepare their speeches, because it would be impossible for them to improvise on the very important problems they have to discuss. As far as the average member of parliament is concerned, however, my experience is that if he is left to himself he is much more eloquent and receives much more attention from the house and also from the galleries if he does not read his speech.