

*Business of the House*

impatience, as there always are; but it was confined to that. There was never at any time a suggestion from this side of the house that the debate should be unfairly limited, or that members of the Social Credit party should be placed under the undue, unfair and exhausting pressure the hon. member for Peace River is seeking to apply at this time.

It is said that after all there is no good purpose in our amendment, which seeks to limit the debate to normal sitting hours with, as I have said, the addition of an extra fifteen minutes. It is said that there is no purpose in the amendment, because if we are really interested in discussing this matter fully we should be willing to sit in perpetuity, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has just said might be the effect of his motion. Because then we can speak to our heart's content.

Well, that was slightly amusing when it was first said. But it has ceased to be amusing now, because the repetition of the statement has demonstrated perhaps more clearly than anything else that its sole purpose is, in effect, to shorten the session.

**Mr. Lesage:** On a point of order—

**Mr. Fulton:** The purpose of the amendment this afternoon—

**Mr. Lesage:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Fulton:** Oh, very well.

**Mr. Lesage:** The hon. member for Kamloops has already spoken to the main motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I do not believe he should be entitled to discuss the effect of the main motion. He should stick to the amendment.

**Mr. Fulton:** I will, if you give me a chance.

**Mr. Lesage:** The hon. member was talking about the effect of the acceptance of the main motion.

**Mr. Fulton:** I have been discussing the effect of the amendment, explaining that its purpose is to limit the debate to the confines of normal sitting hours at the end of a session.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet (Mr. Lesage), it is correct, as I pointed out earlier, that the discussion should be directed to the amendment, and not to the main motion. I have not held hon. members too strictly to that ruling; but the debate has now been going on for some time, and I think probably we had better get back to the amendment.

**Mr. Fulton:** I agree with Your Honour entirely; the debate should be confined to the

amendment before the house. I am sorry we are not in agreement as to the method by which it can be confined. I thought I was directing my remarks to the amendment—at least, that was my intention. If I have been transgressing, then I shall try to follow the ruling. But I do wish to say that the purpose of my remarks at this stage is to demonstrate that if our amendment is carried it will not necessarily have the effect of prolonging the sitting days of this session. Because other debates, on subjects just as hotly contested, debates to which the term "filibuster" has been applied, have been carried on and concluded at the end of the session, under pressure of the desire to get home. This happened late in December of 1945, with normal sitting hours.

Our amendment seeks to confine the discussion on this hotly contested subject to very nearly normal sitting hours, only fifteen minutes longer than normal, instead of the motion under which it is proposed to allow it to proceed all night, all the next day, all the next night and so on ad infinitum until by sheer exhaustion all subjects on the order paper are disposed of.

What I am trying to do is to set out the purpose of the amendment and to show the hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet amongst others that it will not necessarily prolong the session but that in fact it will probably have the effect of shortening it if our amendment is accepted instead of the improper motion that has been placed before the house. On the question of how best we are going to shorten the session, I am as anxious as any other member for reasons which will be obvious, namely, that my home is in British Columbia and it is very questionable whether I am going to be able to get home in time for Christmas even now, that it may be possible for members to get home for Christmas. I think the debate can be concluded and members allowed to leave here just as quickly if the amendment proposed is accepted as will be the case if the motion carries.

I point out in that regard, however, that with respect to the question of the length of the session I find it a little unseemly that there should be this desire to shorten it. After all, when we came here in October we were given to understand, and the people of Canada were given to understand, that we were coming for a full normal session. I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. members opposite that by no stretch of the imagination can we be said as yet to have had a full normal session of parliament. Under these circumstances, bearing in mind the responsibility we owe to the people of Canada who have sent us here expecting us to