

*Privilege—Mr. Broadbent*

to proceed to the motion that stands in my name on the order paper, the effect of which will be to limit debate in this House to four days." On its face it has an admission within it that members will not be allowed to speak. In fact, on its face it says that because members will not be allowed to speak—and this is Parliament where members are supposed to be allowed to speak on the most fundamental issue there is, "—you can file written essays, gentlemen, not beyond 3,000 words, please. We do not want to overburden *Hansard* so let's not do that."

That is the issue today. Madam Speaker, I said publicly and I am going to say in this House, that I will resist with every legitimate procedural device there is—not rushing into the House to call the bells early or anything like that, but, with every legitimate procedural device there is—the opportunity for the government to call the motion which stands in the name of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) and that is that closure motion which, instead of the quick death of Standing Order 33, is a slow strangulation method. The end result is the same, that my colleagues will not be able to make their speeches.

We have, in fact used—and I use "we" collectively because members of the House on all sides have been involved in the discussions—a fair amount of parliamentary time. I want to say to my friend directly that while that motion stands on the order paper in his name, that closure motion, we are going to use parliamentary time and we are going to waste it.

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

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** We are going to waste the time that could otherwise be used in allowing Members of Parliament to utilize the right which they believe they had because they believed the Prime Minister. Madam Speaker, that is the position which we take.

**Mr. Crosbie:** We are going to hangar down.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** We are not objecting, after every member who wants to speak has the right to speak, to the question being put on the constitutional resolution itself. We realize that has to be the effect of the debate, but we take the view that this is so fundamental to Canada, to the sense of togetherness of the country, to the sense of this Parliament, to everything that all of us in this House, I think, should hold dear, no motion which is closure by another name ought to stand between the right of Members of Parliament to exercise what we believe is our right, and that is the right to speak.

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

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, we on this side listened very carefully to what the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton had to say in the last few minutes. I hope he will listen to what I have to say in the next few seconds.

The House leader of the official opposition in this House just stated publicly that his party intended to deliberately waste the time of this House—

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** No!

**An hon. Member:** That is not what he said.

**Mr. Pinard:** —if the government was not willing to withdraw its motion to limit time on the constitutional debate. Those were his exact words, Madam Speaker.

**An hon. Member:** No.

**An hon. Member:** You should listen.

**Mr. Pinard:** We are speaking now on a question of privilege raised by the hon. Leader of the NDP. The basis of that question of privilege is the right of this Parliament, this institution, to work. The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton said, "We will resist with every legitimate device there is . . ." I say this is wrong. What they have been doing this week was not to use legitimate devices but was to use frivolous points of order, frivolous questions of privilege, to delay and obstruct this Parliament, and stop this Parliament, this institution, from working. That is what they were doing. This is not a legitimate device at all, Madam Speaker.

If I may be allowed and if my colleague is patient, I will quote from the constitutional debate those few lines, and I ask them, I beg them to listen very, very carefully as I read:

The policy of the opposition was just this—they wished to spend the whole of March and the best part of April in the general discussion upon my motion; and then, when they could do nothing more to nauseate the House and disgust the country with the subject, when they had wearied the members and made the reporters sick with their talk they were to spend the remainder of April, all May and June, and run the debate well into summer, upon the amendments they intended to propose one after another. It is because these honourable gentlemen have not endeavoured honestly and candidly to discuss the question, but have played the game of prolonging the debate to midsummer and preventing the House coming to a final decision upon it, that the government have taken the step now proposed—

**An hon. Member:** Who wrote that?

**An hon. Member:** Machiavelli?

**Mr. Pinard:** No, that was not Machiavelli, that was Sir John A. Macdonald 116 years ago.

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

**Mr. Pinard:** I just heard an hon. member from the other side say that I was quoting Machiavelli. I was quoting Sir John A. Macdonald when he was delivering his speech in the great debate on a resolution to establish confederation in Canada, Madam Speaker.

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

● (1530)

**Mr. Pinard:** May I remind my hon. colleague that I was quoting from the great debates on confederation, specifically March 5, 1865.

**An hon. Member:** It went on all summer.

**Mr. Pinard:** At that time debate on confederation started mid-January and ended on March 11 that year.