

*Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation*

is claimed to be the fact by another hon. member and another hon. member is misrepresented, that hon. member does not have the right to stand up immediately and interrupt the member who has the floor. He must first make sure that the member who has the floor will permit him to make a correction. If not, he has the right to make the correction at the end of the hon. member's speech. Let us have that well understood. As long as there is consent on the part of the member who has the floor the other hon. member may do so immediately. If not, he has the right to do so at the end of the speech. That is standing order 37, paragraph 1.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to you. I withdrew my remark about "Texas buccaneers" too soon. I have a clipping here—"Texas buccaneers won't control gas line, Diefenbaker."

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

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** I have stated the urgency of the situation as expressed by three provincial premiers. Incidentally, one was a Social Credit premier, the second was a Liberal premier and the third a Conservative premier. Therefore it is not a political issue in the provinces. They have expressed the urgent need as seen by the responsible governments of those provinces.

Obviously the opposition takes the view that there is no urgency, no need to get on with the project at all. So far there has been much more debate on points of order than there has been discussion of the merits of the project. On motions to adjourn alone I think that more time has been consumed than has been consumed by Liberal speakers since the debate began. I do not know what hon. members expect the government to do when faced with obstruction of the type we have had.

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

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** What we have done is apply the rules of the house that were established to protect—

**Mr. Fleming:** Something Mackenzie King refused ever to do and which he denounced.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):**—both majorities and minorities. Hon. members opposite are fond of quoting the mother of parliaments. What does the mother of parliaments do? Every debate in the British parliament is limited from the time that the debate is moved. If it cannot be done by agreement it is done by closure, and for debates where agreement could not be arranged it has been necessary to exercise closure an average of 21 times a year in the past five years.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. King said it had never been done in the British parliament on a money bill. You know he said that in 1932.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** Some say that it has not been the practice in Canada. Why? Because it is only in the last two years that the government has been faced with filibusters openly declared.

**Mr. Fleming:** You did not like last year, did you?

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** When the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) gets out on the stump he is free with his remarks. I read a statement he made to the effect that this would be a filibuster in perpetuity.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker—

**Some hon. Members:** Sit down.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The minister is not resuming his seat. Once the minister concludes his remarks the hon. member can put the matter—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I simply rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right, the hon. member rises on a question of privilege, but I want to point out to him—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I say that statement is not true.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. If the hon. member raises a question of privilege and it turns out that his question of privilege is a fraudulent one—

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Speaker!

**Mr. Speaker:** The expression is being used regularly in the United Kingdom House of Commons.\* I have not the reference here with me but for the edification of the hon. member I will bring it to the house. Sir Winston Churchill himself used it. He rose and said: "Mr. Speaker, have these fraudulent points of order and fraudulent questions of privilege not become a scandal in this house?"

The point I simply want to make is this. The hon. member who has the floor is entitled to make his speech without interruption except, of course, these quick interjections which go on the record. But when a member stands up and wants to take the floor away from the one who has the floor, it is either on a point of order or on a proper question of privilege but never to make a correction or to debate an argument or a point advanced by the member who has the floor. He has a right to do that at the end of the member's speech.

\* (For references see page 4032.)