

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

country were warned by prominent members of the official opposition and of the C.C.F. group over the radio, in the press and wherever they could find a chance to speak, that they were going to filibuster the pipe-line bill.

Mr. Fulton: What a panic you fell into.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): We knew that early in January. Over this 4-month period they kept the threat before the public continuously that they were going to filibuster, and it was suggested that the filibuster of last year was but a drop in the bucket.

Mr. Fulton: Panic, panic.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): Closure is a rule that originated in the mother of parliaments, and we hear that quotation from the Tories quite often. It has been used 122 times in the past five years at Westminster.

Mr. Fulton: They do not have a closure rule there like this one.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): Why should the Tories object to the use of a device of their own creation, because it was their own prime minister who used it first in this country. I want to suggest that I am one who believes that closure should have been used long ago, and I want that to go on the record right here tonight. One case was during the debate on the wheat bill a couple of months ago, when we sat here day after day and heard the same thing over and over again.

I say that for this reason. The very people whom we were trying to help were the ones who were filibustering. We who come from eastern Canada and from the far western part of the country suggest to you that it gets very tiresome when we have done everything we can to try to assist that particular group and we have to sit here and take abuse for doing it. That is why I am suggesting tonight I only wish that we had used closure before, and I hope we use it more often in the future.

I have one other thing to say. I see my time is getting short. I hope the day will never come in a democratic country when the majority are unable to rule. I believe in an opposition.

Mr. Ellis: When are you going to say anything about the pipe line?

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): I have said more about the pipe line than all of your group put together since the debate started. I believe in an opposition, surely, but I do not believe in minority rule. That section of the British North America Act quoted by the [Mr. Stuart (Charlotte).]

hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George on Tuesday night is a very appropriate and a very good reminder.

Mr. Fulton: What has that to do with the pipe line?

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): The section he referred to was section 49, which reads as follows:

Questions arising in the House of Commons shall be decided by a majority of voices.

Mr. Rowe: Voices?

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): And when we get away from that fact we are getting a long, long way from democracy.

Mr. Rowe: You did say voices?

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): There would have been voices heard in every case if your group had not forced recorded votes. If you had not done that about two-thirds of the votes would have been standing votes; but no, you wanted to waste more time and keep your whip in the corridors and up in the rooms.

Mr. Rowe: You said voices but you won't let us talk. You tell us we can vote but not voice.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): Constructive criticism is a fine contribution to any debate, but when one criticizes without at the same time suggesting some alternative proposal one is wasting one's own time and the time of the house.

Mr. Rowe: So you say.

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): The opposition have stated many times that they have been denied the privilege of discussing the first three clauses of this bill. Surely they will not insist they have discussed clause 4 after this debate is over, because we have listened to a discussion concerning everything in the wide world except the bill itself. They have, without interference from the chair—they have never been called to order—strayed as far away from the subject as they liked. We have had a rehash of elections in Quebec and Saskatchewan and in other places, and no one was called to order.

The last thing in the world that group wanted to do was discuss this bill. Why? It is for one reason and for one reason alone; they do not have a single constructive suggestion. There was not an idea in their heads, any more than there ever was. The only thing they wanted to do was discuss procedure and waste time in an effort to delay this thing.

I will mention one other matter briefly. We have been told on many occasions that this is one of the most important debates