

*Procedure and Organization*

75A and 75B have been used. He said there has to be prior consultation. The government house leader has to be able to stand up and say that he tried to get agreement under 75A or 75B. Therefore we are supposed to have some kind of protection. Does he not realize that what will happen will be along these lines: There will be a meeting of the government house leader with the house leaders of the opposition parties, and there will be a suggestion that we agree under 75A to a certain limited period of time. Then, if we cannot all agree he will try to get three of us to agree under 75B. We won't like the small amount of time that will be offered, and we will start to argue for a little more time. And after that is done we will be told, "If you are not prepared to operate under 75A or 75B I will use 75c." Even if he does not say this, 75c is there like the sword of Damocles—although not quite, because the sword of Damocles did not come down. The rule is there like a real sword over our heads, which means that 75A and 75B are practically nullified by the power which 75c puts into the hands of the government house leader.

● (4:00 p.m.)

The government house leader and others who will take part in this debate may say that 75A and 75B represent suggestions I made before the committee. That is correct. The minutes of the committee will show that I proposed them almost in the wording in which they can be found now. But I proposed 75A and 75B as a total package. If you remove 75c I will still buy 75A and 75B and be proud to have had something to do with suggesting them, but I cannot buy 75A and 75B in a package with 75c which completely nullifies any possibility of the kind of bargaining that should be possible under 75A or 75B. It is like collective bargaining with compulsory arbitration hanging over people's heads or the threat of government action. Bargaining between the house leaders under 75A and 75B will not be free and meaningful as long as 75c is part of the set-up.

**Mr. Francis:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes.

**Mr. Francis:** Through you, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member in respect of 75B whether he agrees with the submission of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the representatives of the opposition parties could constitute a majority, not

including the representative of the government party?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I think that is a nice little point on which one could spend time and not have time to deal with other matters.

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

**An hon. Member:** Let the little men howl.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** If I could have the time to deal with it I would be quite happy to do so. I do not think the amendment the President of the Privy Council wanted to put into 75B was necessary at all. I think that the wording in 75B which says that the government house leader "may move a motion under 75B does not require him to move it and therefore 75B does not operate unless one of the majority is the government representative. Concerning what would happen to 75c if it was argued that 75B had not been fully brought into play, that is one of the fine procedural arguments we could have if 75c comes into play. I suggest this is highly hypothetical because surely debate in this parliament is still effective, surely we are still concerned about the procedural rules of parliament, and before this is all over we will not have a 75c.

I congratulate the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton—please do not raise a point of order until you hear what I am about to say—for not making a mistake when he talked about the point at which 75c could be brought into play. He said it could be applied only after there had been debate. I was listening carefully for him to make the mistake of saying how much debate, but he did not make that mistake because he knows that as that rule reads there could be debate for two minutes or indeed for one minute. Let no one stand in the house and tell me I am dreaming something. I was here in 1956. Not many of those who were here then are still here. But C. D. Howe is still here.

In 1956 there was a rule, Standing Order 33, which provided that closure could not be applied until all aspects of the measure had been under debate. We thought that when we got into committee on the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation bill we would have a debate on the separate clauses of the bill. But when the chairman called clause 1 Mr. C. D. Howe got up over there, picked up the bill and read the marginal note, taking 40 or 50 seconds, and then said, "I move that we proceed to clause 2." He did the same thing