

Proposal for Time Allocation

country the pretence is made that that party is opposed to the Liberal party. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon) in his turn goes about the country, as do others of his cabinet colleagues, putting up the pretence that they are against the N.D.P. Thus they confuse the people and fool them. Yet here in the House of Commons the Liberal party is consistently supported by the New Democratic party and sustained in office by that means. It is only on occasions when a rapid counting of heads is undertaken, and the N.D.P. group discover that it is safe for them to vote against the government, that they do so.

Today we were given an example of their support for the Liberal government. They are pretending they are a different party: They are the same. Mackenzie King, wrong in so many ways, was perfectly right when he said the C.C.F. was only the Liberal party in a hurry.

An hon. Member: Mr. St. Laurent.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, Mr. St. Laurent. That is the situation today. They are two parties with different names but the same ideas here in the House of Commons. The N.D.P. people go along with the Liberals.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ask the new parliamentary secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He knows that.

Mr. Churchill: The best example is what has happened in connection with this unification bill. The members of the N.D.P. know very well—and I recognize they are people of intelligence—that the advice of those military experts who gave evidence before the committee, almost all of whom have been thrown out of office, is better than the advice given to this house by the Minister of National Defence. Yet they are co-operating with the minister and sweeping aside all that evidence in their anxiety to support the government. That is another object. They like the idea.

● (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Winch: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Churchill: Certainly.

Mr. Winch: Is the hon. member discussing what he may think is the way we are going to vote on the issue of bringing this matter to a decision, or is he saying now how we are going to vote on clause 2 and on clause 6?

Mr. Diefenbaker: You have said it.

[Mr. Churchill.]

Mr. Winch: The question before the house now is the matter of bringing the issue to a vote. It is not a discussion on clause 2. If the hon. member thinks he knows how we are going to vote on clause 2 and clause 6 I think he is a little confused, because I do not believe he has the foggiest notion.

Mr. Churchill: I know the hon. member is going to vote against the bill; he has expressed opposition to it. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has said publicly in the defence committee, and here, that unless the foreign policy of the government is clearly established he cannot support the bill, and I think the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge) is going to oppose the bill. I am not sure about the other members of that party, but I am surprised they would support the allocation of time proposal that came up today, since I suggested this other method of dealing with this particular problem and getting the House of Commons out of a difficulty. Be that as it may, we will see what happens when the time comes.

It is regrettable that an issue like this cannot be solved by agreement. Sitting on both the other side of the chamber and on this side, I have seen innumerable agreements arrived at, when difficulties were amicably settled in the lobby behind the curtains. These things are not recorded in *Hansard*. Neither are they recorded in the press, but experienced members of the house know how the house works. There is a tremendous amount of work done by agreement. This is how legislation goes through, unless we run into legislation that is controversial, such as the unification bill.

On many of our items of legislation there is an exchange of information, party to party, as to how many people are going to speak and how long they want. This is never publicly pronounced, but when you get a controversial bill you run into trouble. When a controversial bill is before the house the government should assess the opinion of the house, and should not press on with such a bill to the point that we have reached now, where it is going to impose closure, which is a restriction on freedom of speech.

We have not entered upon this debate lightly. We are not conducting a filibuster. Our opinions on this bill are soundly based, firmly held and rooted in conviction. We think the bill is bad for the country, and we are supported by the opinion and sound judgment of a great many former military personnel who