

of the Opposition, one could have taken exception to his own speech, which had so much of an interesting autobiography about it. There was also a somewhat doubtful reference occasionally to history.

My right hon. friend referred to Mr. Pym. I would remind the right hon. gentleman that Mr. Pym was a republican who helped to abolish the monarchy.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then he should be well considered by you.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): While my right hon. friend has not had the opportunity of serving in the British House of Commons, I do know that he follows the deliberations of that house with great interest. But I am rather surprised that in his championing of the rights of members of this house he suggested that in the British parliament in a similar situation there would be no doubt what would happen. I too have followed the debates of the House of Commons in Britain, and I am sure that their rule in this regard is not basically different from ours.

What has happened here is that the Speaker has determined, with some doubt, that there is a prima facie case and he gave the benefit of that doubt to the hon. and persistent member for Edmonton-Strathcona. If there is any man in this house who could not justifiably make an argument in favour of his position on the grounds that he had been denied the right to speak, it is the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, whom we have heard day by day on this theme.

I am not complaining about the hon. member's right in this respect, but the fact that he has so exercised that right certainly abridges somewhat the strong advocacy of my right hon. friend that this member should not be denied the right to express his views as a member of this house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In the committee.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of all the members who now occupy seats to the right or left of Mr. Speaker, no one has enjoyed with greater relish and greater luxury the opportunity of speech than the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think that having the responsibility of determining whether he shall continue with this marathon, we must now take into account the interests of

Question of Privilege

parliament itself. As the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre said—

Mr. Churchill: North Centre.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said, there are not only rights for individual members of this house but there are rights for parliament itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There are rights for the majority.

Mr. Nugent: Are you coming over to my side?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what the Minister of Finance said—get rid of the opposition.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There are rights for the majority just as there are rights for the minority. It was that, I am sure, that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) had in mind when he said we would make ourselves ridiculous if, after having thrashed this matter out as we have done day by day, we were solemnly to refer this matter to a committee as though there had been a serious violation of the privilege of one who happens to represent a responsible sector of the people.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Nugent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Acting Prime Minister can suggest we have thrashed this matter out day by day when in fact a procedural point which the Minister of National Defence refused to remove did not allow us to discuss it.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Perhaps I should not have said "day by day". Perhaps I should have said the hon. gentleman spoke every second day.

I think we have had an opportunity to express our views, Mr. Speaker. There is a clear consensus in this house, and we cannot ignore a consensus even on the part of those who sit immediately to the left of the Speaker, that we should get on with the nation's business and proceed with the discussion of the bill which is now before the house.

Mr. Churchill: And bring it in in 1967?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. gentleman said "and bring it in in 1967". It is brought in now and we should not allow