

*Procedure and Organization*

to govern? Or, better still, closure at one or more of the debate-stages of a bill's passage? No government is likely to forget the people's anger when closure was used during the Pipeline Debate. A deterrent was created there, and before any government overrode the opposition it would have to feel certain it had the people behind it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the onus in the present debate is on the government. Once again I detect a similarity between this debate in this parliament and the debate of 1955 in a previous parliament. Here, I wish to refer to the words of the late Hon. James Gardiner, then the minister of agriculture, who proved himself a great Canadian by his outstanding service to his province and nation. He became carried away by continual Liberal government and became somewhat arrogant and overbearing because, as recorded at page 1422 of *Hansard* for 1951, he said that as long as he, the minister of trade and commerce, and the prime minister, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, were here, the country would be assured of good government. There, however, the similarity ends because we all know that the President of the Privy Council has been told that until the Prime Minister decides he must not make a move. He is not a member of the present troika made up of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and the Prime Minister. So, he cannot sit in on their deliberations, he has been told to follow orders and to disregard what his colleagues in the backbenches, who should be looking after their businesses and getting acquainted with their families, may think.

In the former case I alluded to, two members and public opinion prevailed on the minister involved, C. D. Howe, and he was persuaded to go on holiday—maybe a fishing expedition with some of his colleagues from the Maritimes. When he came back a time limit had been placed on the legislation being considered and the opposition had won a battle for democracy and for parliament, the people's forum.

In closing I should like to say this. Rule 75c should never have been brought before the house. The government no doubt will win the vote and bring 75c into force; but that will not be a defeat only of the parties in opposition; that will be a defeat for parliament itself and for the democratic order it represents.

**Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, I hope that in delivering my remarks this evening I can avoid generating the rancor and bitterness which seems to

have been evident during the last two days of debate.

**An hon. Member:** Impossible.

**Mr. Hogarth:** It is my view, sir, that over the past decade or so, bit by bit the respect of the people of Canada for this institution has slowly been eroded. The science of politics in Canada has failed to keep up with advances in the other disciplines of the community. We have failed to provide immediate responses to challenges taking place in a rapidly changing society, and the younger generation that is now coming up is firmly of that opinion.

The reasons for this are obvious and some of them have become obvious in this debate during the last two days. Other reasons could be cited. I do not blame any particular government, any particular member or any particular opposition party here or in the other place for this. I just say that we have failed to accept change and to respond and react to it.

In my opinion, the people of Canada today think that we are all talk and no action.

**Mr. Stanfield:** That is right.

**Mr. Hogarth:** I think there is some justification for what they say.

**Mr. Stanfield:** That is absolutely correct.

**Mr. Hogarth:** I say that because in the last six months we have seen debates in this house—and I admit that both sides participated in them—which took a seemingly endless time to conclude.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Why does the hon. member not talk about policy?

**Mr. Hogarth:** We have seen debates which in part were filibusters and which were admitted by one segment of the opposition here to be filibusters in part. As a result, it has taken us until July to finish the work of the house.

Actually, we began debating the present subject matter last November, and the debate has not yet finished. We have seen how the Standing Orders of the house have been used to obstruct and delay the work of the house. We have had that obstruction in place of the constructive criticism the opposition is supposed to supply here. As a matter of fact, I have heard so much about this man Beauchesne in the last three days that I am convinced he would not be elected dog catcher in my riding. I think it is time to bring in a few changes to the rules.