

Business of the House

have been so defective in this regard as to have allowed him not only to second the motion we have before us but also to make very inaccurate statements with respect to the previous occasion he had in mind. Because when the hon. member for Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) was speaking, upon the occasion of his moving the amendment this morning, he referred to the previous filibuster carried on by the hon. member and his party in 1945. The hon. member for Annapolis-Kings pointed out that thirteen members prolonged the debate on the Bretton Woods agreement for six days.

Mr. Low: That is not true.

Mr. Fulton: The debate on the Bretton Woods agreement occupied six days, and it was the party of the hon. member for Peace River who occupied the greater part of that time. If they had not wished to prolong the debate I imagine—and I was here on the occasion—it would not have lasted for more than two days.

Mr. Low: Your memory is very short.

Mr. Fulton: I have consulted *Hansard* in this regard.

Mr. Low: So have I.

Mr. Fulton: Just before saying what I have found, I wish to point out that this morning the hon. member for Peace River interrupted the hon. member for Annapolis-Kings by stating that the house was then sitting only from three o'clock in the afternoon until eleven at night. But that is not the case. During every one of those days, when that prolongation of debate was taking place, we were sitting from eleven o'clock in the morning until eleven at night. The debate took place on these days: December 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 14, 1945.

Mr. Low: Only part of each day.

Mr. Fulton: If the hon. member for Peace River feels that it was appropriate for only thirteen members to prolong the debate for six days—

Mr. Lesage: On a point of order, I am wondering to what extent the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) is in order when he revives the debate of 1945, when we are discussing an amendment the effect of which would be to prolong the hours of sitting for today only for fifteen minutes.

Mr. Speaker: This point has been mentioned by the hon. member for Peace River. I would ask the hon. member for Kamloops to reply as briefly as possible.

[Mr. Fulton.]

Mr. Fulton: The point I am trying to make is related definitely to the amendment we have moved. My point is that in 1945, when this prolongation of debate took place, we were able to dispose of it within the normal hours of sitting at the end of a session. Our amendment moved by the hon. member for Annapolis-Kings would restrict the hours of sitting to those normally applicable at the end of this session, with the exception of fifteen minutes.

What I am pointing out is that, on the basis of the best precedent, it is perfectly possible to conclude this debate within the normal hours of sitting. That is why I am defending this proposal in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Annapolis-Kings.

As I say to the hon. member for Peace River, in all fairness and with all pleasantness—and I have no desire to be unpleasant—I do not ask him to bear in mind that if his party of thirteen felt it appropriate to prolong the debate over six days in 1945—and I am not suggesting that they took every hour or every minute of that time—then I cannot quite see that he is being consistent and fair when he criticizes us because forty-six members of this party wish to have an opportunity for full debate, and thus far have continued the debate for only two and a half days. Forty-six members, two and a half days: thirteen members, six days.

I appeal to the hon. member's sense of fairness. In that regard I wish also to point out what was emphasized a short time ago by the hon. member for Eglinton, that this debate has not been monopolized by members of the official opposition. Fifteen speakers have taken part in it. Then, other parties have also had fifteen members taking part, divided as follows: Eleven Liberals, one C.C.F., two Social Credit and one Independent.

I submit therefore that a comparison of the two situations, those of 1945 and of today, is entirely in our favour. I appeal to the logic of the hon. member for Peace River. In the light of what they did in 1945 I submit that, if he wishes to be fair, he will agree that we have not by any means exceeded the bounds of propriety. We have not in any sense been unfair nor have we abused our rights, or our responsibilities to the house. Only one-half of the members occupying the time in the debate thus far have been from this party, and the debate has lasted only two and one-half days.

I would point out that in 1945 there was no suggestion at any time, particularly from the official opposition, that the debate on the Bretton Woods agreement should be choked off. There may have been exclamations of