

Proposal for Time Allocation

Mr. Nasserden: I have a question for the leader of the house. Is he insinuating that the intervention of Liberal speakers in the debate represented an encroachment upon the decision-making process?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think we are making any progress at this point.

Mr. Forrestall: I should like to ask the distinguished house leader whether, in the light of the evidence given before the committee by Brigadier Lawson and confirmed in this house that in any case from four to six months would elapse before the government could move to the promulgation of this bill, because of the regulations which have to be drawn up, he would comment on the position of the discussion on clauses 2 and 6 of this bill if we ask to have them stood over until the fall.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member seems to be under a misapprehension with regard to the process followed in what he calls the promulgation of the bill. I presume he has in mind certain regulations which have to be made and certain steps which have to be taken once the bill is passed and has become an act. Then the proclaiming of the bill becomes a procedure which does not need the concurrence of parliament; either the House of Commons or the Senate. It is an act by the executive on a different procedure, and in the interval between the passage of the act and its promulgation there is the authority in the Interpretation Act providing for those responsible, once it has been passed and approved by the parliament of this country, to pass the regulations under it. This is the essential difference. The hon. member seems to have missed the whole essence of it.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the house leader to explain why, since as late as Tuesday of this week, when the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre moved that we go on to other business and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer) said "We are going to continue with the unification debate in order to give you every opportunity" now in defiance of the express promise of the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence that every opportunity would be given for a thorough examination of this bill, they are bringing in this closure.

Mr. McIlraith: I would be very happy to explain. I joined completely with the Minister [Mr. McIlraith.]

of National Defence, and I am happy to note we were in such total accord, in going contrary to the official opposition's effort to prevent this bill from being discussed in the house on Tuesday, when we had given notice to resort to the procedure under standing order 15A. He, like myself, did not wish to deny the House of Commons the opportunity to discuss this bill that day and make progress with it. As to the second point, the misuse by the hon. member of the word closure, I have already dealt with that.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the play on words by the Minister of Public Works is clear and apparent. This isn't closure, he says, when in point of fact it is nothing else; and by simply saying that it isn't what it is, he in no way meets the argument that the guillotine is to be used in place of the axe.

I listened with interest to his dissertation on parliamentary debate and the manner in which it should be carried on, and I could not but be reminded of the words of Lewis Carroll when he said—and this describes the attitude of the minister.

"I weep for you," the Walrus said:
"I deeply sympathize."
With sobs and tears he sorted out
Those of the largest size,
Holding his pocket-handkerchief
Before his streaming eyes.

Oh, what an idea, to think parliament would ever consider that these paragons of parliamentary practice who sit opposite would do anything wrong and shock those sensibilities of which the minister spoke. I quote to him the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one of the great democrats of this nation, one of the parliamentary giants of all time. Apparently the minister has not read what Laurier said. A moment ago he was complaining about the number of days that had been taken up in this debate. If my estimate is correct, in the days that have gone by 30 members other than members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition have spoken.

Mr. Starr: On the second clause.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Of course on the second clause, as the hon. gentleman says. By way of an answer, let me read what Laurier said to those people sitting opposite who in 1967 are revealing that they have forgotten 1956.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They said the same thing then. I could quote one and all, the Minister