

*Standing Orders*

do anything that would interfere with freedom of speech, freedom of debate and freedom of discussion. It has been said: "that to be a slave of old tradition is as great a folly as to be a slave of new quackeries". I think we have heard and seen many quackeries since this parliament has been charged with the administration of the country. Let us get away from these quackeries and be simple and natural in our arguments. Let us provide rules for our parliamentary system for the good of the nation and the best of our parliament. Now I would like to say a few words in French and I shall be quite brief in the remarks I intend to make in my own language.

(Translation):

Any institution, excellent though it may have been and still may be, which does not reform, loses its power of resistance through the ravages of time and of public opinion. The natural political evolution of a nation calls for reform. It is far better to adapt our parliamentary forms to this inevitable change than to see the very foundations of our system shattered, sooner or later, by disastrous revolutions.

A nation's parliamentary system may be compared to the shores of a continent. It is wonderful to see how, against the blows of the waves, continents take on shapes which reduce the effects of this incessant beating upon their shores.

That is why I would like this parliament to have, from time to time, control over its own procedure so that it may be adapted to our times. Speed is a characteristic of the present day. While everything, save parliamentary debate, moves with ever-increasing rapidity, we spend endless hours discussing subjects which, in a great many cases, cease to have any importance, even before the debate is brought to a close.

I therefore support, most enthusiastically and with the greatest conviction, the resolution moved by the hon. member for Halton.

(Text):

I want to congratulate the hon. member for Halton on having brought before the house a matter which is of such importance to Canada.

**Mr. G. A. Cruickshank (Fraser Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to take only a few minutes of the time of the house. I think I should be given credit for having introduced a similar motion in 1940. I have never read a speech yet and I do not intend to. The only speech I have ever read was one written for me by Torchy Anderson, a member of the press gallery; Blair Fraser; the Minister of

[Mr. Boisvert.]

Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner); and Mr. Brockington. I read that one into the record and it sounded fine to the people at home, but I have heard lots of other stuff. I have listened to the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) and I have listened to other hon. members of this house since 1940.

I told you how you could reform the other place and I want to tell you how you can reform this place. I placed all this on the record in 1940. There are just two simple rules that need to be enforced. I mentioned before how two members from the press gallery and two distinguished gentlemen had written the only speech I ever read. I do not know which one was the worst. Probably my reading was.

If you would enforce the rule that speeches be not read and limit speeches to a maximum of twenty minutes, we could improve our proceedings. I can say without fear of contradiction that there are not five members in this House of Commons who can make a speech lasting forty minutes that is either interesting or entertaining. If you enforce that rule I will keep under twenty minutes and I will not read a word of what I have to say. I am quite well aware that I can have an excellent speech written for me by somebody else that I can put on *Hansard* and send out to my constituents as these gentlemen do who read their speeches.

**An hon. Member:** Not all of them.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** I do not care whether you like it or not. Any man who reads his speech must have had it written for him by somebody else.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

**Mr. Cruickshank:** I have never read a speech yet. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) will make a speech on anything at any and all times. I admit that, but I want to say, so far as Fraser Valley is concerned, that despite what the hon. member who introduced the resolution says, nobody is going to limit me when it comes to speaking on any subject if I see fit to do so on behalf of my constituents. I say this is the solution, and some of the junior members to my right might listen to this. When the member moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne and the seconder only speak for twenty-one minutes and all from memory we do not need forty minutes to say what wonderful ridings we have, and members of the house do not need to take five minutes to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder on the wonderful speeches they have made. That is nonsense. Let us get down to the two rules. Limit any