

Business of the House

party and any other party in the house regarding the question which is now before the house, and the hon. member for Kamloops must take his word for it.

Mr. Low: Earlier in the day I said the same thing with respect to this group, that there was no collusion among the three of us.

Mr. Speaker: Under the circumstances I would ask the hon. member for Kamloops to accept the word of these two leaders.

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Fulton: I accept the assurance of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) and of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) that there is no collusion. In that event I think it is desirable that we define our terms. Since apparently we are not in agreement as to the definition of the word "collusion", I will say that there is co-operation among those three parties on the motion before the house. The hon. members who are concerned tell me that there is no collusion among them, and I accept that statement. But I tell them that they will have to face the fact, that they will have to deal with the rumours that are going around the corridors of this building that there was a consultation between their parties and members of the government on the advisability of presenting such a motion. I am reporting that as a fact. It seems to me that if they do not want to explain that, it is for them to decide.

Mr. Coldwell: May I rise again on a question of privilege? The dictionary defines the word "collusion" as meaning a fraudulent and secret understanding between ostensible opponents in a lawsuit, and of course in any other way. If there is fraudulent and secret understanding charged against members, I submit that the word is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

Mr. Fulton: I withdraw the imputation on any broad line, but it certainly seems to me that there has been a secret understanding which has now come out into the open. I withdraw any imputation. I am glad to do so. I did not look it up before using the word, but I have already substituted the word "co-operation".

Mr. Coldwell: That is open and aboveboard and quite different from the other word.

Mr. Fulton: The hon. member can draw his own conclusion. I have stated it as a fact and he will have to deal with or ignore the rumours which are circulating through this building that there was a prior consultation.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has endeavoured to set himself up as arbiter of whether or not all the debate that

could usefully take place has in fact taken place. I was pointing out that for him to do so is to go far beyond any arbitrary position he has ever accused this government of taking. It shows the folly and the danger to which we would expose this parliament and this country if at any time the C.C.F. should be elected to power.

The hon. member must have known this motion would be bound to give rise to a considerable debate. Had it been introduced by any other party or by the government with respect to a measure in which his party was vitally interested it would have given rise not to one day's debate but to a debate of two, three, four or five days.

Mr. Lesage: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Kamloops, in spite of the indications that have been given to him by you, Mr. Speaker, and by Mr. Deputy Speaker, is still speaking on the main motion moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He is not dealing at all with the amendment before the house. Before you came into the house Mr. Deputy Speaker warned hon. members that they should abide strictly by the rules, that they should speak to the amendment which is before the house at this time and not to the main motion.

Mr. Speaker: I agree with what has been said, but it is difficult to speak on the amendment without making some reference to the main motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members of the opposition say "hear, hear." I am going to try to enforce the rule that the debate should be relevant, in spite of the difficulty. The member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) during the course of his remarks referred quite fully to the main motion, and to the result of adopting that motion. It is, therefore, not fair for me to tell the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) that he cannot say anything about it. I will ask the member for Kamloops to make his remarks as brief as possible and reply to what was said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. After that has been done will hon. members kindly address their remarks to the amendment and not to the main motion.

Mr. Fulton: I thought I should like, if I may, to answer a question which the member for Winnipeg North Centre asked me in the course of his remarks this afternoon. I am glad you pointed out to the member for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Lesage) that I was in fact dealing, at the time of his interruption, with the remarks of the member for Winnipeg North Centre. As I said earlier,