

Standing Orders

speaker to twenty minutes and entirely eliminate the reading of speeches that in ninety per cent of the cases are written by somebody else.

Mr. Daniel McIvor (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say.

An hon. Member: Do not read it.

Mr. McIvor: I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down. I would also pay my tribute to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) because he prepared his case so clearly and did not read his speech. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) said that we do not want a little ring. That is what we want to eliminate. There are too few members occupying most of the time of the house. What has happened in this debate? The hon. member for Halton introduced the question. One member from the Progressive Conservative party, one from the C.C.F. party, and one from the Social Credit party, representing one-third of the membership of the house, take more time than those representing two-thirds of the membership of the house. That is not a proper proportion.

I agree that no member should need forty minutes with the exception of the leaders of the parties and, as the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) has said, a member should not need to read his speech if he has had time to prepare and think about it for days and days. If he cannot remember it when he comes into the house how can he expect hon. members to listen to it when it is poorly read? I do not think we need forty minutes. When we were students we were told that a short address with more punch in it was far more important than a long dry address with energy left out.

An hon. Member: That is a long time ago, Dan.

Mr. McIvor: I have only been in the house a short time. At least, that is what it seems to me. In that period I have seen two reforms. Last year the hours were changed and this year we are back on the same old hours. I think we should adjourn at ten o'clock at night and that a man should be able to go home and sleep a little while before twelve. The other reform we have had is that ladies were allowed to go into the gallery without their hats. We have that reform today. Perhaps we will see more of it in the spring of the year when they are getting tired of their old hats anyway. I think that the ladies should be allowed to knit in the gallery. There are clubs knitting for the Red Cross, war services and relief causes. If the ladies

got tired or could hear somebody then they could knit, enjoy themselves and serve their country.

There is another reform I should like to mention. I have spoken of it before. You, Mr. Speaker, stand up reverently in the house and lead us in worship but the galleries are empty. Not even the representatives of the press are allowed to enter. The prayer you use in your service is in keeping with the teachings of the Great Teacher who said that whosoever will may come. I hope that this reform will take place soon and that people will be allowed in the gallery to join with us in bowing their heads and worshipping the Supreme Being.

I know that a book on science ten years old is out of date with the exception of the science of government. The science of government certainly does need to be reformed, and the hon. member for Halton said that the rules of the house need to be amended and improved. If we do not improve them it is a sign that we are not doing what we should, but the word "liberal" means reform without any "pro" before it or "co" or "so" tacked on it. It means that we can grow and reform.

Mr. J. A. Bradette (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long in presenting a few of my viewpoints about the rules of the House of Commons. Before I proceed I want to pay a tribute to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) for his resolution which has given us an opportunity to discuss at some length a matter that has not only been before the public but before parliament for many years; namely the reform of the rules and procedures of the Canadian House of Commons. A day such as this makes every parliamentarian and every Canadian realize the logic, the artistry, if I may call it that, of the British parliamentary system on which our own parliamentary system is largely based. Early in the session there is an opportunity to discuss resolutions brought forward by private members. I do not believe there are many democracies that have perfected that system to such a degree, and I for one, although I am in favour of the drastic changes in our present procedures and rules, will go slowly as far as some of them are concerned because after all we are considering procedures which have been tried and tested not only for years but for centuries, but which in our times are not fulfilling their purposes.

I want to say a few words about a statement made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill). He referred to the time taken by ministers of the crown. I think it would be unfair for me to mention the time of the house that has been taken on