

My hon. friends opposite claim they have not had time to debate this bill. Well, this is the twenty-second or twenty-third day of the debate—I am not sure which—

An hon. Member: Watch your mathematics, Charlie.

Mr. Nowlan: Two plus two makes twenty-two?

Mr. Cannon: There is nothing wrong with my remarks as you will see when you look at them. If you consider the proceedings of this house you will see that every year we have about 50 bills which go through parliament. Let us suppose each bill took ten days—which they do not, of course—that would be 500 days, more than a year. This bill has taken 20 days of debate—

An hon. Member: Now it is 20.

Mr. Cannon: —and the 20 days of debate that have been given over to discussion of this bill is more than all the time given to all the other bills in this house since the beginning of this session. Despite this, hon. members opposite say they have not had time to study it. Why have they not had time to study it? Obviously it is because they have been wasting a great deal of time of the house on phony points of order and on motions to adjourn the house, simply wasting the time of this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cannon: The public does not realize and I think the public should be told that it takes half an hour for a vote in this house. How many votes have the opposition forced since the beginning of the debate on this bill? Up until May 25 last, according to the computation of the *Montreal Star*, we have had 35 votes.

Mr. Nicholson: How much time would you save if you did away with parliament altogether?

Mr. Cannon: If my hon. friend wishes to talk in this debate he can do so later on. The hon. member has no right to interrupt me while I am on my feet. Will you please keep quiet?

An hon. Member: We are all speakers now, eh?

Mr. Cannon: We had had 35 votes up to May 25 last. By now we have had 45 and out of that 45 possibly 10 were necessary in the ordinary procedure of this house; 35 votes were forced upon us by the opposition on phony points of order and on motions to adjourn the house just for the pleasure of wasting half an hour on a vote in order to defeat the motion. Therefore, you have 35 times half an hour

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation which makes about 17 hours spread over 20 days.

Mr. Nicholson: What would you save if you did away with parliament altogether?

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Brown, Essex West): Order.

Mr. Tucker: We would save having you around.

Mr. Nicholson: That is the logical conclusion.

Mr. Dickey: You would not know a logical conclusion if you saw one.

Mr. Cannon: That is not a logical conclusion because the rules of the house—

Mr. Nowlan: What rules?

Mr. Cannon: —are made to advance debate and not to impede it and using the rules of the house as you have by moving motions to adjourn and so on just for the pleasure of wasting time is—if it is not too strong a word—a prostitution of the use of the rules, putting them to a use it was never intended they should serve.

I have just a few more remarks. I am sorry to see the hon. member for Eglinton is not in his seat but I am sure his friends will relay to him anything I have to say. I started to talk about him this afternoon but I was forced to conclude my remarks.

I remarked on the fact that he put on a good show, tremendous histrionics, and made quite a spectacle in getting himself removed from the chamber—

Mr. Nowlan: Oh, cheap, cheap.

Mr. Cannon: —getting his picture taken and having the flag ready. How did that flag happen to be in this house or in the lobby?

***Mr. Dinsdale:** It was an organized affair.

Mr. Cannon: I would like someone to tell me that and also explain the organized meeting at the airport—

The Acting Chairman (Mr. Brown, Essex West): Order.

Mr. Cannon: I have a few quotations here including the two great financial papers of Canada. In its edition for May 19 last the *Financial Post* says:

The recent noise on parliament hill over the gas line should be recognized for what it is: a violent effort by the opposition parties to mislead and befuddle the Canadian public in the hope of making political profit for the next election.

So much for the *Financial Post*. The *Financial Times* of June 1 has such a good editorial that I should read practically the whole thing—

*For further reference, see page 4662.