

In that period of about seven months there were 36 Conservative speakers and NDP. Second reading took 15 days. I might also mention that the petroleum administration bill was introduced during the twenty-ninth parliament and there was a long debate at that time. Bill C-8, the Petro-Can bill, was given first reading on October 3, 1974, and finally passed on July 23, 1975. Second reading took a total of 11 days. With regard to this bill, there were 12 meetings in committee when only clause 2 was dealt with.

If we are going to allocate time intelligently in this House, we have to do something about these prolonged debates. In at least one instance there was a real filibuster in this House. That was with regard to the petroleum bill. The business of the House cannot continue unless we get rid of this kind of prolonged debate where the attempt is not just to debate the issue but to prevent a bill receiving second reading. Yesterday, a number of members said that this bill should not have been brought forward at this time because there are far more important things to debate, such as inflation, the restraint guidelines, and so on. However, 34 Conservative members spoke on that bill for 14 hours.

In the British House of Commons I understand they have a way of allocating time. Second reading of a bill usually involves no more than one full sitting. A sitting may be extended to the next day, but normally it is one sitting. The place to debate this bill is in committee. A number of opposition members have stated that they want the bill moved to committee so they can suggest amendments and receive briefs. That is where the bill should be considered in detail. Therefore, I think it is right that we complete this debate in the next five hours and get the bill to committee.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to cover the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, but his attitude indicates that he does not know as much about parliament as he should.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The trouble is that some members sitting opposite, regardless of the length of time they have been here, have displayed the same lack of knowledge of this institution that the member who just spoke evidenced to such high degree. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) is not here at the moment, but it is of interest to note that the motion was moved by him—a motion of guillotine, of closure—and seconded by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Drury), both of whom were long-time civil servants of high degree. Today, they will espouse the philosophy that they held and which is generally held by those in the higher echelons of the civil service, namely, that the House of Commons is of no consequence, they have the answers to all the problems and all we have to do is rubber-stamp whatever they bring before parliament.

I listened to the President of the Privy Council and I had never seen him perform better. It was an outstanding performance of piety and regard for parliament. As I listened to him I was reminded of Sir Winston Churchill's observation concerning a minister who had served in his cabinet during the days of war, Sir Stafford Cripps: he

Time Allocation Motion

said, "Mr. Speaker, God Almighty never made a man as honest as he can look on occasion."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: There he was, today, displaying that love for parliament embalmed only in words. I would suggest, having regard to the philosophy which he enunciated, that he should get in touch with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Basford) who, in the course of an answer to me this afternoon, said that House business is a matter to be negotiated between House leaders. I have never known a better answer. I suggest that these ministers who would trample on the rights of parliament should get in touch with the Minister of Justice who in the few short months he has occupied that portfolio has shown an appreciation of parliament.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) summed up what is being done in one word—stupid. I find myself in disagreement with him. This is not stupidity; it is Liberal government arrogance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is the same thing.

● (1540)

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is the kind of thing we saw in such abundant measure in the House of Commons during the days of the pipeline debate. I recall, too, that when the Liberal party was in power they brought about a flag for Canada by closure, knowing that they could not achieve it otherwise.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. member is just on the outskirts of greatness as a parliamentary secretary, and all I can say is that his applause indicates his lack of knowledge of the subject. I say that with great respect to him.

What are they afraid of over there? The President of the Privy Council says this issue has been before parliament since April. The notice of ways and means was concurred in on April 18 and the bill was given first reading on that date. The bill was debated on May 8, 16, 20 and 26, and then there was a hiatus between May 26 and June 4. Then it was brought in again. Who is responsible for that? A government which does not know how to carry on government!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister who is responsible for this bill surprises me greatly, trying to push through a measure which is widely opposed across Canada, and denying members of parliament the right to express themselves clearly and succinctly on a proposal which is dangerous to freedom of speech in this country and which constitutes a type of censorship. I am not here—I mention this only because we shall be arguing the case later—as a proponent of *Time* or *Reader's Digest*. As far as the latter is concerned, I can see no reason for this legislation. As far as *Time* is concerned, when I see the line-up on the part of those who want to bring about this change, when I see the owners of *Maclean's* magazine which has taken such a