

Procedure and Organization

executive, not to the majority, but to parliament itself.

My leader said the other day, and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was of the same opinion, that there are indications that people in high places believe or are persuaded that we should be governed in this country by a presidential system of government. My friend from Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon) mentioned it again yesterday.

• (12:30 p.m.)

When we used to study the presidential versus the parliamentary system in our political science classes, we made many analyses and comparisons. It was a favourite question of the examiner. There is much virtue in the Congressional system as it is known south of the border, but the presidential system which the government has in mind is not the healthy, vigorous system of the United States. You would have to go farther south than that to find the Congressional system which is in the minds of some people today.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Or to de Gaulle.

Mr. Macquarrie: Perhaps if it is not found in Latin America, it will be found in certain countries in Europe whose parliaments may be an instrument of adornment, but they are not instruments which function. No self-respecting United States congressman or senator would tolerate for one moment the pusillanimous role given to committees by this parliament. I refer to what is an actuality, and that is bad enough, not what may be envisaged by those who would do away with this nuisance and diminish the stupid filibustering and the bother of the people's representatives expressing themselves on the people's business in the people's chamber.

An essential ingredient in the successful working of the parliamentary process is compromise and common sense. You can see this in 75A and 75B. There is something in 75B which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would probably describe as stupid. It was an omission. I would say in a more gentle piece of phraseology that it seems a bit strange. Proposed rules 75A and 75B could be made suitable repositories for compromise and common sense.

Any debate which produces quotes from Edmund Bruke cannot help but be a good debate. Edmund Burke said:

All government,—indeed every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act—is founded on compromise and barter.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

The system cannot work of course unless on the vital issues there is an attitude of accommodation, a desire for consensus and a reasonable approach to compromise in the institution itself.

Rule 75c represents and reflects something entirely different. Not there do you find the wisdom of compromise and the value of consensus, but the impatience of the autocrat, the power madness of the arrogant and the brittle abrasiveness of the technocrat. That is what 75c reflects. What saddens me most is the chance we had when this new parliament came into being. We could have had reasoned and reasonable reform far beyond that which we attained in some of the items which we passed last December. Where would one find a more moderate man than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield)? Where would we find a man more reasonable and patient? Of course some people believe because he is consultative, he is indecisive, because he is reasonable he is weak. These people are now finding out these are misconceptions.

Where could we find a more understanding man than the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin)? Who is less given to fractious activity than that man? Who could we have chosen to typify goodwill more than that man for our house leader? And the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)? I sometimes call him venerable. He has been here a long time, he has said a great many things, but I have never heard him say a mean or little thing about any member of this parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Inside or outside the house.

Mr. Macquarrie: As his leader says, inside or outside this house. There were opportunities for goodwill. How much better it would have been had compromise been the vehicle instead of the bulldozer. Bulldozers wreck and destroy, and sometimes the surface is never the same as it was before.

The lessons of last December have not been learned. Once again parliament is hungup in an angry debate. What is the reason? One of the perspective political writers in our country today is Mr. Dalton Camp. I read from one of his columns:

The trouble with the Trudeau administration which the *New Yorker* did not report, is that it is overlaid with arrogance and it is hell-bent to impose its authority upon the Canadian Parliament to a vastly greater extent than any previous government, which is saying a good deal. Mr.