

*Proposal for Time Allocation*

are and how they are going to be met under this neutralized scheme, and bulldozes this measure through, then Canadians everywhere will have the same feeling they had in 1956. They will feel that the rights of parliament have been trampled on. As far as the people in the armed forces are concerned, while they are now silenced by fear, the day will ultimately come when they will be able to speak out, by which time their morale will have sunk to unheard of levels, I am afraid.

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I could hardly resist the persuasive invitation of the right hon. gentleman opposite to take part in this discussion, so I should like to say a few words on the motion before the house. I am not speaking to the defence bill. There are three more days to discuss that measure and if I have a statement to make on it I will make it during that debate and not during this one which does not deal with the defence bill itself.

The right hon. gentleman did say that we on this side were attempting to bulldoze this bill through parliament. He is suggesting we are bulldozing it when, Mr. Speaker, we are in a minority position in this house and when the motion before us will not pass unless it gets the support of the majority of the members of this house. This is a queer kind of minority bulldozing.

A proposal was made a short time ago that was apparently designed to avoid this discussion. The effect of it was that we give the two clauses of this bill which are controversial, the two clauses that matter, the six months' hoist. That proposal was put before us. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is at least one tempting aspect to this proposal, and that is that if the six months' hoist were given, this matter would not come before this house again until next October. After listening to the right hon. gentleman this afternoon it is tempting to think that perhaps by that time we would be spared another speech by him on this question.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is what you have desired for years.

**Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Speaker, that is not my desire. I hope that my right hon. friend will be sitting in that seat for a long, long time.

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

**Mr. Pearson:** And I am not being entirely unselfish in that wish, Mr. Speaker. The right hon. gentleman, with his customary scatter-gun approach, dealt with a great many things which had nothing whatever to do with this motion. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I noticed something that he has done before, and I say this in no critical way. He redoubled his energy every time he lost his aim.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, may I help out the Prime Minister. That was first said in 1862 by Disraeli.

**Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Speaker; that was first said—and I should put it in quotes—in 1853 by William Ewart Gladstone. I should like to plagiarize some other observations but perhaps I had better begin to make my own speech.

The right hon. gentleman did talk about closure, and that is pertinent to the motion. He was against closure. He said he did not like it and that he could see no distinction between closure and time allocation. I suggest it should be obvious to anybody that closure can be imposed on the House of Commons without the consent of the House of Commons having been sought whereas time allocations cannot. Parliament has its opportunity and its duty to decide whether there will be time allocations, and parliament will decide this evening at a quarter to ten whether there should be an allocation of time to discuss this particular bill.

In support of his bitter attack on closure this afternoon the right hon. gentleman quoted some newspapers such as the *Winnipeg Free Press*. The *Winnipeg Free Press*, in commenting about closure in connection with the flag discussion, had this to say—and this is now one of the right hon. gentleman's favourite newspapers:

Mr. Diefenbaker must therefore answer this question: If closure is the terrible thing which Conservatives pretend, why did he force it upon Mr. Pearson?

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this is what the *Winnipeg Free Press* had to say in connection with the flag debate.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** What is the date of that article?

**Mr. Pearson:** It is the issue of December 14, 1964. It goes on to say:

If the rule itself is wrong—