

the pursestrings from parliament and handing them over to a bunch of kangaroo courts.

In that same article the Prime Minister also said about the Liberals:

Power is what they are interested in. The only kick allowed is that which comes from a donkey. Some say it doesn't matter. Pretty soon, they will be talking about a nuclear storm in a teacup.

That is the Prime Minister's position. Quentin Hogg said:

Countries cannot be fully free until they have an organized opposition. It is not a long step from the absence of an organized opposition to a complete dictatorship.

It was said yesterday that no person in a position of power ever asked for more power without intending to use it. I suggest that no one ever achieved the power he asked for without using at least 100 per cent of it, and history shows that sometimes persons have used 110 per cent.

What happened in Europe? Italy had a parliament. Then it had a dictator by the name of Mussolini. Kerensky led a revolution in Russia and started a form of legislative assembly. Then came Stalin and parliament died in Russia. Parliament died in Italy. Look at what happened with Hitler. He was elected in an ordinary election, and then the Reichstag was burned down so that he might walk through the ruins as a dictator.

When we are going to reform an institution let us not destroy that institution. If we give men in powerful positions that much power without the rule of law then they have the right to abuse that power. History has shown us that human behavior is such that men will abuse power and then freedom dies. Lapointe said that what they were fighting for was the right of parliament to live.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say that we are 100 per cent for reform except on these two issues. We want to get on with the nation's business. We do not want to gag parliament by having closure in advance and taking away from this institution the right of criticizing, analysing and probing the expenditures of the nation when taxes are so high already and are running rampant throughout the nation.

Why does the cabinet not meet and say, "We will approve these other rules. We will try the reforms we have got and leave out these two matters." Or if they want to have a little more reform then, as our party recommends, leave only 20 per cent or one-third of the estimates to come before parliament because they will not take up any more time

Motion for Concurrence in Report

and there will not be any more hours spent in debate. That is our position. I ask the government to consider it carefully. I trust they will be reasonable men and consider it.

I close with one last thought. Government spokesmen describe this debate as holding up the works. It is the government that is holding up the works. It can now approve what all of us on this side of the house agree to and send the other two matters back to the committee for careful study. There are reasonable men in this House of Commons on both sides. They would not have been elected to it otherwise. If this is done then believe me we can get on with the nation's business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I had the honour and privilege of being a member of the special committee which was to report on the reform of our parliamentary procedure and it certainly was a practical experience which I greatly appreciated.

Several members who have been sitting in the house for many years and who are experts on matters of procedure let us have the benefit of their wise advice and counsel.

Under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), the proceedings for the amendment of the standing orders were constructive and frank. In fact, all the members admit that the present standing orders do not meet present requirements. If certain important provisional changes were made, it must be admitted that the house has been exceedingly slow in amending its standing orders. During the last election campaign and since then we promised to change our rules in order to increase efficiency of the Canadian parliament and to use more wisely the time available to us. We are of the opinion that instead of engaging into lengthy and repetitious debates we should rather study a larger number of pieces of legislation and consider in a constructive and positive way, the estimates required by the various departments and bodies coming under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, the government has fulfilled its promise. There is no issue which had and still has stronger and more general support among the people. In fact, they agree that we should engage in discussion, but they require that we make a decision after a reasonable