

things were tough at home. We are paying a price to be in confederation, and we want to know that things are being run well and run from an all-Canadian point of view.

The last issue, and I feel it is the most important, is one that is bigger than the pipe line. It is bigger than anything we have considered here. It is the issue of closure and the associated rights of parliament. I have my thoughts on the matter. Some people may say that it is a sinister move of the government to bring into Canada an evil form of government that is not known on the North American continent. In a recent report from Ottawa, Norman MacLeod said in an article:

Canadians can expect the use of closure on an increasing scale. For it is about to become, so far as the St. Laurent government is concerned, an accepted and routine feature of the machinery of parliament. That is something that very few among the M.P.'s themselves realize, most taking it for granted that the current resort to closure in connection with the pipe lines bill is a one shot performance.

But the other evening a senior cabinet minister commented: "There is one really big thing that the government has done in its handling of the legislation in parliament; it has revived closure as a part of the normal legislative process."

How evil are these thoughts, Mr. Chairman.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Bell:** As I said, there will be various reasons given and various explanations made why the closure motion was introduced, particularly why it was introduced in the committee stage at the first shot, an unprecedented move in our history. That, Mr. Chairman, was the day the great Liberal newspapers of Canada turned against the present government. The *Winnipeg Free Press* and the *Toronto Daily Star*, in editorials that have continued until today, have criticized as strongly as they can the use of closure at the committee stage in the unprecedented way it was used.

What is the reason for this, Mr. Chairman? I will tell you the reason I think it was invoked. The reason is that the members of the present government, particularly those who sit on the front benches, have not the respect for the traditions of parliament they should have, and I will tell you why they have not. Because they have not any political background.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Bell:** All right, I will back that up. There are eight members of the present cabinet who had no political savvy whatsoever when they were appointed to the cabinet. More than that, they were not even members of parliament. I am going to take a minute to deal with this point, because I think it

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

goes to the root of the whole problem. They have not the respect for British traditions that they would have had if they had been interested in politics before they became members of parliament. Let us look at the record. The Prime Minister was appointed to the cabinet on December 10, 1941. He was elected a member of parliament on February 9, 1942.

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

**Mr. Bell:** How about the Minister of Trade and Commerce?

**Mr. Sinclair:** Twenty-one years in parliament and you have been in parliament three years.

**Mr. Bell:** How about the time before that? How about the time he was in business?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Bell:** All right, this is my point, Mr. Chairman. He was elected in 1935 and appointed to the cabinet on October 23, 1935.

**Mr. Sinclair:** Twenty-one years.

**Mr. Bell:** What do these people know about grass roots politics in Canada? What do they know about our traditions?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Bell:** Hon. members laugh, but I wish today that Edmund Burke could come into this house and see the flagrant use of closure that has been made. I would love to bring Disraeli and Gladstone here and show them a silent Prime Minister on one of the most important days in our history. These members of the cabinet do not have that appreciation of the traditions of politics that mean so much to us, or the early training that would have prevented such action at this time. To sum up this point, I say that is one reason in my opinion why we are having trouble today, because in the cabinet there are eight men who came up the easy way.

**Mr. Sinclair:** Jimmy Gardiner?

**Mr. Bell:** They did not win their spurs in politics in any respect before they came to the glorified positions of members of the cabinet. I can name them, too. There is the Minister of Labour sitting there.

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

**Mr. Bell:** I shall not go into his background. In fact perhaps I should say that he did have an interest in politics. How about the Secretary of State for External Affairs?

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

**Mr. Bell:** How about that other civil servant, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration?