

*Procedure and Organization*

through any bill under rule 75c. If that is what he believes, is he prepared to accept an amendment that no bill shall pass in less than four weeks from the time it is first introduced? Many measures go through here in a day and many go through in two days, but if it is a piece of legislation to which we object, surely the government should be prepared to give us a month in which to debate it. These are the sort of things that could perhaps get us out of here some time before we are due to come back.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Before the hon. member takes his seat I should like to ask him to clarify his last point. He said that the opposition would like a month in which to debate a piece of legislation. I take it he means a month of elapsed time, not debating time.

**Mr. Aiken:** Oh, yes, the proposal which I understood the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to make yesterday was that it should take at least a month of elapsed time. I do not think we would ever suggest that we want to debate any item for a month.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Except this rule.

**Mr. Aiken:** There are always exceptions. But certainly the suggestion I am making is not that we should have a month's debate. I am suggesting that we should have a reasonable number of days on any item and a month of elapsed time.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** How many days would the hon. member consider reasonable, bearing in mind that there must be a general rule relating to the time for debate of bills?

**Mr. Aiken:** The house leader has three opposite numbers here with whom he can consult and I am sure they are anxious to consult with him. I do not happen to be one of them.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I would find it interesting to hear the hon. member's views on this question.

**Mr. Aiken:** You have heard them.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, debates on matters such as this always bring out interesting aspects of the house during the process of debate. Even if members do take a rather long time in debate sometimes because of a lack of will to co-operate and make arrangements, perhaps it may be a good thing—every cloud has a silver lining—

because we at times learn some quite unexpected things from debates.

I noted with some interest as, I have observed, a number of hon. members did this afternoon, the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome). He is a new member of the house and apparently a very promising one. I take it he is expressing the views of the new bright young men in the Liberal party who are represented in the house. If not, perhaps members on the other side would correct me in that regard. But I was certainly most interested in his theories regarding parliamentary government and how it should be run. For a while I thought I was listening to a speech which I had heard before. I tried to search my memory to discover where I had heard it. It was not a speech of Joseph Goebbels or Benito Mussolini, but after a while I realized where I had heard it and I was quite surprised. It was a speech I heard as quite a young man in the days when I was attending university. The speech was made over the radio—we did not have television at that time—by Ann Morrow Lindbergh in the late 1930's. It was called "The Wave of the Future". She spoke about what the young people must look forward to and what they must expect from the government.

People of my generation listened to that speech with interest because the Lindbergh-family was very famous. Charles Lindbergh had achieved many things in the field of aviation, they had an unfortunate family tragedy, and they were also mixed up in political theories regarding the German-American *Bund* in the 1930's. That speech made by a member of the Lindbergh family was the closest thing I could recall to what I heard from the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome), except that it was more moderate than the views he expressed. Perhaps I misunderstood him. I will have an opportunity to read *Hansard* tomorrow, but I would be rather upset, as I think other hon. members might be, if he was in fact expressing the views of the bright new members of the Liberal party.

So far as the motion before us now is concerned, may I say that one should never impute motives to others for a very good reason, because no one really knows what goes on in the skulls of hon. members opposite or indeed of anyone else. So one can only draw conclusions from evidence and facts. It seems to be a reasonable conclusion to most people that in view of the timing of this debate there was not much good faith exercised in bringing up this matter at this time.