

*Standing Orders*

But there is one thing I think we should get rid of. Oftentimes a member will read a speech containing phraseology which is so different from that which he normally uses that we would not recognize it as the remarks of the same man. That is what I object to. I have always had a suspicion that somebody else has had a hand in its preparation. When members come down here to represent constituencies they have the duty to speak on behalf of their constituents without the assistance of other people who may put in their mouths words that they would not normally use.

There is one thing I should like to have particularly noted by the backbenchers. More and more backbenchers should speak. I know my hon. friend will say that this resolution is designed to bring about that very thing, but there are other ways of doing it. Hon. members are sent here by their constituents. Their constituents may realize that they are not great public speakers, and perhaps that is why they have been elected. I do not think anyone in this house should be fearful about getting up and expressing his thoughts even though they may not be expressed in the language that might be heard in the appeal court of Ontario or of some other province.

After all, the House of Commons is not an appeal court. A person who has not a good education has as much right to be heard here as anyone else. This is the place for everybody to be heard, whether he is educated or not. This is the place where the people who sent them here should hear them, even though their voice may be halting and hesitant. I do not think anyone should have any fear that he is inferior to anybody in this chamber, because he is not. In this chamber one person is as good as another whoever he or she may be. I should like to see that view adopted as a battlecry so far as members of parliament generally are concerned. As I said before, I enjoy the contributions made by those who do not speak often and who usually speak sectionally. Even if they do speak about their own sections I am often more interested in hearing what they have to say because it gives me a better idea of Canada as a whole. We should hear what people from various sections of Canada have to say, and the speech from the throne and budget debates provide an opportunity for that. I have spoken a lot longer than I intended, but I really should be allowed some special consideration because I am speaking in reply to a government motion.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Graydon:** The hon. member did not put that badge on it but I am going to do so for him.

**Mr. Cleaver:** I am sorry but I cannot accept it.

**Mr. Graydon:** In any event, in so far as our work in the House of Commons is concerned, I am not one who thinks that we should be complacent as to the present rules of procedure or the present conduct of debate. I have not felt that way for a long time. I think there are many people who are distressed and disturbed that we do not handle our business with better dispatch. Although on this occasion I have not given the house very much information, and perhaps there has not been a great deal of intellectual content in my remarks, at least I have done what I have urged the backbenchers to do. I have spoken my mind.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us in the house agree that there is room for improvement in our rules of procedure and in some of our practices. Indeed there are a few suggestions I shall make while I am on my feet, but I think I should make it clear at the outset that I do not agree with the suggestions put forward by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) in the motion now before us. Since I intend to express my opposition to most, if not all, of that motion, the responsibility devolves upon me to show that there are other steps that could be taken and to indicate the things that I think might be done.

In the first place I think it would add materially to the debates that take place in the house and to the endeavour to deal with our business more effectively if we could adopt hours of sitting at least similar to those that were in force toward the end of last session. I am sure if we could get it established for all time that we would adjourn at ten o'clock at night it would improve the spirit, morale, good will and everything else around this place.

**Mr. Cote (Matapedia-Matane):** What do you mean by "everything else?"

**Mr. Knowles:** After all, most members arrive here pretty early in the morning. They get here around nine or nine-thirty every morning, and I suggest that by the time it is ten o'clock at night it would be a good idea to call it a day. I suggest that far from that extra hour shortening the session it actually lengthens it because many speeches made during the last hour are merely made to keep the debate going or because tempers are frayed as the result of the long time that members have been here during the day.