

Procedure and Organization

some of the suggestions we have made? I think they would work very well. Why does it not give our suggestions a try? Let us implement some of this new thinking.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we were told that this session, which apparently is ending with debate on the new proposed rules, was to end on June 27. We were to go home for our summer recess and come back, according to my information, on October 9. If the government has been so held up on its legislative program, why was it willing to give us a recess of 3½ months? I am human, I like a 3½ month recess, and so does everybody else here. But, Mr. Speaker, if legislation was being held up, if legislation was not moving through parliament as quickly as it ought, why did the government propose such a long summer recess? It is not right under those circumstances that we should be sent home for 3½ months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the government wanted us to rise for two reasons. First, it does not like being questioned by the opposition during the question period and, second, Liberal Members of Parliament—and there are many fine, new Liberal members here—do not want to stay around here during the summer months. They feel that being asked to stay here is an imposition on them. Consequently they have exerted great pressure on the government to rise for a summer recess.

I say this to Liberal Members of Parliament. We are well paid on a year round basis and it is our duty to stay here for 12 months of the year if necessary, and do our jobs. We are here to put pressure on the government. Many problems face this nation. We should be considering how to check inflation, and how to stop the rise in the cost of living which is going up at the rate of 10 per cent every year. The government brought in its budget. When I spoke on the budget I think the minister paid attention to me. He answered several of my questions, but there were several he did not answer. I told him that the imposition of new taxes calculated to slow down building in our major centres would have no effect. I said that no builder would wait for two years and have his cost of building increase by 24 per cent, and that sooner than do that a builder would prefer to absorb any extra tax. The minister did not answer that. I also said that the government is doing nothing about controlling inflation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. May I remind the hon. member that we are discussing a specific amendment relating to proposed standing order 75c. I think the hon. member should talk about that.

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I always bow to your rulings, and will do so at this time. I was dealing with an important matter, but I think I have made my point.

In closing I say to the government that if it is sincere in wanting the parliamentary process speeded up, it ought to consider some of the suggestions which some of us here have put forward. The ones I made would not curtail anybody's rights in parliament. They would still allow the opposition to do the effective job it was elected to do. They would make parliament a far more effective place because the speeches would be shorter, better prepared, and would be listened to by more gentlemen in the press gallery and by ministers of the government who have to make any necessary changes. My suggestions would speed up parliament and make it a far more effective place in which to work. I say to the government: delete this foolish, stupid, dictatorial rule 75c which would hamstring the opposition and make it impossible for them to do their job. It should be thrown out the window so that parliament can be put on the rails once again.

● (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Before the hon. member takes his seat, may I be permitted to ask him two questions? He was talking about time limits. I do not know whether the hon. member is aware that some of the time limits are 20 minutes. Is the hon. member suggesting they be cut to 10 minutes? My second question—

Mr. Hees: I will answer your questions one by one. Yes, certainly. This was proved during this session when we of the opposition of our own volition on certain opposition days decided that in order to allow twice as many speeches we would cut our speeches to 10 minutes. Do you know what the result was? The 10-minute speeches were infinitely better than 20-minute speeches. The members prepared their remarks and gave excellent speeches. We are very much in favour of 10-minute speeches, so the government can cut them to 10 minutes any time they want.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Does the hon. member agree his 35 minute speech would have been a good one to have been tabled without delivery?