

*Procedure and Organization*

have made himself. He is a very decent guy outside the house but terribly obnoxious inside the house.

In beginning my remarks I have one quotation which I should like to place on the record. It is the following:

It is not up to a particular man, convinced of the soundness of his opinion, to express the will of the house.

I take that to mean that no one man should presume unilaterally to take unto himself the right to express the will of this house. I submit that that is a pretty sound statement. I could lend support to that position, and I intend to do so. As a matter of fact it seems to me this has been the crux of this whole debate. This is the central theme of this so-called stupid filibuster. The parties in opposition feel that proposed rule 75c does exactly what is mentioned in the quotation. In other words, a particular man, convinced of the soundness of his opinion, can in effect express the will of the house. May I repeat the quotation:

It is not up to a particular man, ... to express the will of the house.

Do you know who said that? The Prime Minister of Canada, who was then Minister of Justice, said that on February 27, 1968. It is to be found at page 7038 of *Hansard* of a year and a half ago. That was his opinion. Does he still subscribe to that view? It does not look very much like it. The government he heads in effect says that what is good for the Grits is good for the nation. I am reminded of a famous cartoonist, Al Capp, who depicted a character called General Bullmoose, who always ended up by saying that what was good for General Bullmoose was good for the nation.

What do members of the government say to the opposition? They say in effect, "Here is a piece of legislation, fool around with it but do not try to change or improve it because we know what is best, and at ten o'clock a week from Thursday"—or whatever date they select—"it will become the law and that is it."

Perhaps it is an oversimplification to refer to just one particular man expressing the will of the house. It might be more accurate to say it would be the troika, plus two, who make the decision to express the will of the house. A troika is a three horse hitch. We have a triumvirate over there of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and the Minister of Regional Eco-

[Mr. McCutcheon.]

conomic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). That is the troika or triuvirate. Then that is augmented by the addition of two men, the government house leader who fires the balls, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) who is on there because of his vast knowledge of the rules. It is a pity he does not know a little bit about agriculture.

Since that day in 1968 when that profound statement was made a lot of things have happened. We have had an election and the man who made the statement, "It is not up to a particular man... to express the will of the house", has become our Prime Minister. Since that time we have operated under some new rules, or modifications of the old ones. I submit that they have not worked too badly. Nothing of course is perfect. I am sure, however, there has been quite a marked improvement over days gone by. There is no question about it; we in the opposition have co-operated. We have tried to give them a chance. The fact that they have muffed their opportunities is really not the fault of the opposition. But they would like to suck in someone on whom to blame some of the trouble.

The hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) came up with a dandy proposal on Tuesday. He had a complicated mathematical formulation which involved the opposition in implementing 75c. I believe the hon. member for Peel South was quite sincere in his proposal to end this impasse in the house. The fact that his suggestion was most impractical does not detract from his obvious sincerity. It does, however, point out a favourite Grit ploy—when things go well take all the kudos; when they go bad try to lay the blame on something the opposition did. In severe cases where neither of these devices works, do as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) does and imply that things are not as bad here as they are in the United States, or in the United Kingdom, and that there is really nothing we can do about it anyway. You see, they know full well that 75c is a bad rule. The hon. member for Peel South in typical Grit fashion tried to arrange it so that the use of this iniquitous rule could in the future probably partially, if not totally, be blamed on the opposition.

If you do not think that is correct, let me quote from page 11231 of *Hansard* for July 15:

The important thing is that the Official Opposition and the government would constantly share the responsibility concerning whether we would ever use 75c.