

*Procedure and Organization*

issue which to many Canadians struck at the very heart of Canadianism, at their cherished belief in a flag that has now gone. They felt that their representatives were in parliament to express their views and to fight the matter as hard as it could be fought. I am sure that those who wanted a new flag felt the same way. After a lengthy battle, the issue was resolved and the new flag was unfurled. No one can say that the issue was not properly or fully debated and fought to a conclusion.

Another of the alleged abuses that has been spoken of occurred during the era of the four horsemen of the "eclipse"—Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Martin. One suffered a certain weariness and dreariness while listening to them as they made their points. I felt some of the sting of many of these points, and in one election campaign they made their points well. Gentlemen on the Liberal side of this chamber say that the lengthy debate in which those people engaged were in the cause of liberalism, though this is not to be permitted when members of other parties do the same thing for some party cause.

The only abuse I can think of at that time, apart from the great waste of parliamentary time, was when Mr. Pickersgill deliberately talked out a motion to appoint several new judges to the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia which would have allowed that court to modernize itself by creating both an appeal division and a trial division. This step had to wait for some months because of the deliberate action Mr. Pickersgill took. He took this action not for any great or noble cause; he took it for sheer political reasons. He did not like to think that any Conservative would be appointed to the Nova Scotia bench. I do not know how he gets along now with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), because he has now redressed the inequitable stand that was taken by Mr. Pickersgill.

I should like to go back to an abuse by the Liberal government of the day, one that could be perpetuated time and again if Standing Order 75c were adopted. I refer to the pipeline debate. This debate reflected the quintessence of some gentlemen's ideas about how parliament should be run, how it could be turned into a superb sausage making machine. When closure was imposed the clauses of the bill under debate were rammed through one after the other. The only legislation I might be particularly concerned about, in so far as 75c is concerned, would be the amendment to the Indian Act. I would not

permit any government, so long as I can stand up here and speak, to have those powers which 75c would confer on it. If the Indians went on the war path and right thinking Canadians joined them on the war path, parliament would have to act. I would not like to think what would happen if, through invoking rule 75c, the amendments to the Indian Act were to be disposed of in 11 days or so. After all our Indians have the right to expect the white man to keep his word, and the time permitted under 75c would not be sufficient for us to arouse public opinion. That is the basic issue before us.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We do not trust the Prime Minister; let us be frank, Mr. Speaker. We have no reason to trust him. We trust some members of his cabinet, but we do not trust the Prime Minister. We must resist 75c if we are to maintain a modicum of respect for ourselves and if we are to maintain parliament as a viable institution for those members who will follow us.

I wish to correct an unjust impression that may have been left about the government house leader. He had his knuckles wrapped by various people on this side of the house last week with respect to statutory instruments, as will be seen at page 11035 of *Hansard*. There was a failure of consultation. We had agreed to allow the measure to go through and if there was lack of consultation, it was through my fault. I did not get around to seeing everyone I ought to have seen. I wish to put my apology on record since at present, when we are all tense and when we all tend to quarrel with each other, it is a good idea to vindicate the house leader. I therefore wish to make that correction, Mr. Speaker.

Having dealt with Liberal spokesmen of the nineteenth century, may I now deal with Liberals of the twentieth century. Let us turn to the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one of the great Liberals of this country, surely.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** That's good reading, Bob.

**Mr. Bell:** Something has gone wrong in the present century.

**Mr. McCleave:** I am reading from a book entitled, "Political Pamphlets, 1912-15". On the cover is the word "Liberal". I am sure hon. members opposite will think my reading is to good purpose.