

*National Defence Act Amendment*

he has put to the minister, he and his colleagues have the right to deny every other member of this house the right to make a decision. As hon. members know, this has been going on in the committee for the past 10 or 12 days in the discussion on clause 2.

However, that is not all. We have also had a repetition of thoughts which had already been advanced in the house previously—

**Mr. Churchill:** Prove that.

**Mr. Olson:**—respecting the same matter, during about four days on an interim supply motion in November of 1966. We also had the same arguments advanced on second reading of the bill earlier this year. In addition there were about 40 meetings of the standing committee on defence—I am not sure of the exact number—where the same ground was covered.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** We have heard that also.

**Mr. Churchill:** The hon. member is repeating himself.

**Mr. Olson:** It seems to me to be a complete contradiction for anyone to subscribe to the provisions of a democratic institution and at the same time argue that he has a right to prevent members of that democratic institution from taking a decision, after all the points of view from all those who want to be heard have been put forward. The only argument that was advanced by the hon. member for Oxford this afternoon to support the continuation of this filibuster was that the members of his party have not received satisfactory answers from the minister.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Does not the hon. member realize that the Minister of National Defence just denied him an answer?

**Mr. Olson:** I am not arguing at this time whether or not I agree with the answers given by the Minister of National Defence, but if hon. members wish to be reasonable they have to extend to the minister the same privileges as to any other members of the house. They cannot force him to say something he does not want to say. The minister has a right to his opinions, the same as members in the Conservative party have a right to their opinions, and have a right to express them. The hon. member for Oxford said a few moments ago that only 25 out of 95 or 96 members of the Conservative party have taken part in the debate.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I never said that.

[Mr. Olson.]

**Mr. Olson:** We know that some of them have spoken on clause 2 as many as four or five times. Surely it follows that if any of the other 70 or 71 members of that party wanted to make a contribution to the debate they would have full and ample opportunity to do so. Therefore no member in the house has been denied the right or the opportunity to speak; and I contend—

**Mr. Régimbal:** Seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

**The Deputy Chairman:** It being seven o'clock, pursuant to an order made on April 6, the committee stands adjourned until 8 p.m.

SITTING SUSPENDED

SITTING RESUMED

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Olson:** When the committee rose at seven o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I was making a few comments on the amazing argument advanced by the hon. member for Oxford as to the justification for this filibuster that he and his party have been carrying on for the last few days on clause 2 of this bill. It seems to me that it is a disservice to this house and to the standing orders—

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Why didn't you bring it up at the time?

**Mr. Olson:**—for any member to attempt to defile the provisions of the standing orders which have been agreed to by this house. I know he is probably still under the illusion that there is some stigma attached to the word "closure" because of what happened in the House of Commons in the famous pipe line debate of 1956. He may be right. However, as I said, I believe this is an illusion. While I was not in the house at that time, I am convinced from reading the record and having taken an interest in the proceedings through the various news media, that there were other contributing factors in that particular debate which led to success in the next election campaign.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, it is a wrong concept of the processes of democracy when a small number of the members of this house can continue to violate the rules to carry on a filibuster which results in preventing members from taking a decision. I am reasonably sure that the hon. member for Oxford and his colleagues, the 25 to whom he