

*Time Allocation Motion*

forced through under closure. He did not point out that the closure motion that was used for this purpose was rule 33, a Sir Robert Borden creation back in 1913. Not only have I been involved in some battles against the imposition of closure; I have contended, in speeches and in written articles, that if this place is to survive we must find ways to better manage and allocate our time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I am glad to hear the support from the government side. But managing and allocating our time does not mean having the government side do this unilaterally or dictatorially. Both sides of this House were elected properly and officially. Both sides ought to have their say. I believe that we can work out rules on the basis of all—

**Mr. Baldwin:** You had your chance in 1972, and you blew it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It was in 1972 that the twenty-ninth parliament was elected, and thank heaven, we got lots of things through in that parliament before this government went completely reactionary.

I point out that we have been willing at any time to agree to an all-party arrangement to bring this debate to an end. We have kept our speeches to the minimum. Yesterday, only one of our members spoke—our leader. He talked no longer than 15 or 20 minutes. Today, only the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) is to speak, and he is always brief and to the point. We have said in our speeches that we are not as scandalized at Bill C-58 as are our friends in the Progressive Conservative party. Hence, I make the point that I am not speaking against the use of Standing Order 75C as one who wants to block the vote on Bill C-58. We think it should come to a vote, and have said so a number of times. We also know that the vote on second reading will not be the end of the bill. It must go to standing committee, remain there for goodness knows how long, return for the report stage, and be read the third time. So if the decision to close this stage of the debate is taken, it is not the end of democracy. But I still think it is a stupid way to go about it.

**An hon. Member:** Do you spell that with a double "o"?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I hear my hon. friend asking if I spell "stupid" the usual way, "or s-t-o-o-p-i-d." At any rate, this is a stupid way to deal with the management of the time of this House, and we shall vote against this motion. I am sorry this method is being used, not only because I think it is the wrong way to bring this debate to a close but because it is a setback to efforts for arriving at a reasonable and rational arrangement for the effective use of the time of this House.

[Translation]

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues of the Social Credit Party of Canada, I want to express our very deep concern over the position taken by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) who has to resort to Standing Order 75C, which is, in effect, taking away the privilege acquired through our electors, the opposition's right to speak. As far as we are

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

concerned in respect of this bill, we did not abuse the time of this House, something we never did.

I would state at this point that Progressive Conservative members appear to be more directly involved than we are in the legislation, possibly because they have a larger representation of constituents against and receive more correspondence opposing the bill. First I must commend that party for having spoken so often. I believe in a democracy one can speak when one feels, and when one must do so in this House.

When he introduced his motion, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) suggested his view was shared by a number of members in this House. I submit that point of view, on the motion introduced under rule 75C this afternoon, is not at all shared. I believe this is unilateral action. We in the Social Credit Party and all the House leaders here, both opposition and government, feel there are far fewer interventions, far fewer changes in time allocations for the various bills, as the hon. member said before me, when there is a consensus between the four House leaders. I believe the procedure is much more successful thereafter, and there is much better opportunity to prepare for a smoother and shorter debate, and a better chance of being heard.

I believe rule 75C has no place here this afternoon and would create a very dangerous precedent, because rule 75C is used to deal as swiftly as possible with Bill C-58 within five hours, after two hours' discussion on the motion for rule 75C which makes seven hours in all. The bill will not be voted this week yet. The business on Bill C-58 is further delayed by two or three days.

I suggest that with this move, the President of the Privy Council demonstrated he simply will not talk with House leaders. That I regret very much, and I hope it will not happen too often.

● (1530)

[English]

**Mr. Paul E. McRae (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the motion to limit debate under Standing Order 75C. In the past two days I have heard many comments by opposition members about this motion and Bill C-58. The term "censorship" has constantly been used. They say the government is censoring *Time* and *Reader's Digest* and bringing censorship into this House in terms of this motion. I will later speak about *Time* and *Reader's Digest* to show how ridiculous it is to say that we are invoking censorship in this case. I wish to deal with the motion and the history of this bill. This bill has been in the House for 5½ days. There have been 34 opposition speakers—31 Progressive Conservative and 3 NDP. The opposition has spoken for 14 hours and this side for 3½ hours, for a total of 17½ hours. We are proposing an additional 5 hours, which will make a total of 22½ hours.

Since this parliament began in September, 1974, five bills have taken up the bulk of the allotted time. The budget bills took days and days, and the competition bill took weeks. There were a couple of bills in which I was involved, one of which was Bill C-32, the Petroleum Administration Act. It was introduced into the House on October 25, 1974, and given third reading on April 30, 1975.