

*Procedure and Organization*

I still argue that we should work our heads off to arrive at arrangements for allocating the time of the house, but let us do this by agreement. I thought that is what we were working toward in the committee until the last two meetings.

**An hon. Member:** You were fooled.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes, I was fooled. I thought we were going in that general direction. There was good will, good humour and a camaraderie was built up as we get together, ate together, and so on. All this went down the drain when we were suddenly told, "No, it is not going to be done that way. The government is doing to decide when free speech is to be limited."

That is why I feel that standing order 75c simply must be reconsidered. I do not know how long this debate will go on. Last night it took only two hours to win a certain point; I hope it will not take two or three weeks to win this one. We are all going to make the best speeches we can. We are going to argue our cases as strongly as we can, but not just for the fun of hearing ourselves speak or of getting our names on the record. We want parliament to win this issue.

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** What happened in December was not that we or they won but that parliament won when the decision was made to adopt the rules to which everyone agreed and not to adopt the one to which there was violent objection.

I submit that a victory will be won by parliament if out of this discussion we can reach the decision to continue to wrestle with the problem of time allocation. I am not asking the government to drop the idea of time allocation and of planning the year. I am proud of the start we made and of the calendarization that we put into our rules. Let us keep wrestling with the problem until we arrive at a scheme for programming the year, a scheme for allocating time to which we all agree, not one that is imposed upon us. What we have is a rule that is before the house today because it was supported by the government majority in a committee, but only by that government majority. If it goes through, it will go through only on the votes of the government majority, and I suspect that some of them have their doubts about it. If it is put through and is brought into play, the farcical votes that will take place after two hours debate will be votes in which a decision to

cut off debate will be made on the basis of a government majority. The government wins a decision three times as to what the rules of the house should be. It wins on the basis of its majority three times and parliament is out.

My friends over there will say to me in private and in public, "Don't we operate on the basis of a majority?" Yes, we do when we pass laws, when we legislate. But when we make the rules of the game it is not the strongest side that makes the rules but everybody who is involved. One wins this battle not by muscle but by merit, not by brawn but by brain, and I think we have the wit to do it.

I appeal as strongly as I can to the house to support the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the report be referred back to the committee. Perhaps we can do the same thing that we did last December. Instead of having to take the time to send the report back to the committee and let it report again, we can do what was done on December 20. The minister can get up and suggest that the third report of the standing committee be adopted minus rule 75c. That was what was done on December 20 and it can be done now. It would save much time and we could get out of here. All we are here for is to try to straighten out this rule situation. I hope it will be done that way.

If I still have time I should like to read something that was said by the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Prime Minister of Canada for a number of years. These words impressed me greatly at the time.

**An hon. Member:** He was a real Liberal.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** This statement was made in the year 1946 before he became Prime Minister. We were debating the subject of redistribution, which at that time was dealt with by a committee, and also the means of seeking an amendment to the constitution from Westminster. In the course of a debate on how far the government could go in amending the B.N.A. Act by a simple resolution to Westminster, Mr. St. Laurent was asked by Mr. Arthur Smith of Calgary, the late father of one whom some of you know, whether it would be possible for the government to change the language provision of the B.N.A. Act by the simple device of a resolution to the parliament at Westminster. The debate came back to my mind because of the discussion we have had lately.