

Motion for Concurrence in Report

conditions which we criticize when they occur in other countries. Yet there has been no statement of policy, and no action. We have asked for a review of the pensions of veterans who served their country in what some Canadians classify as an imperialistic war. But once again there has been no statement of policy, no action. On the other hand, we have received ambiguous statements, wrapped in allegory, by the Prime Minister and other ministers on occasions when they can be encouraged to enter this chamber and grace it by their presence. Mr. Speaker, this government to date has a record of procrastination, vacillation and tergiversation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: The proposal to turn over expenditures of \$11 billion, the total budget, to unreformed committees means the end of the parliamentary system as we know it.

What should be done about such a situation? Every party should have a certain number of chairmen on these committees. The New Democratic party represents a big vote; it should have a certain number of chairmen. The Ralliement des Creditistes should be represented by a certain number of chairmen on these committees. The moment these committees become non-partisan, the moment they are equipped with the technical help required so that they can get at the government and find out the sins of any government, there may be something to be said for taking \$11 billion from the control of this institution and turning it over to creatures of the government. But until these requirements have been met we are utterly opposed to such a move.

● (4:10 p.m.)

We believe in reform. We believe the committees should be reformed. But we do not believe in destroying parliament by removing control over the pursestrings, which is the only hold which this institution has, finally, upon any government. Combine the implementation of rule 16-A with the power that any prime minister enjoys without checks and balances and, in the words of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), the result is totalitarianism. The Prime Minister wants all probing to end. The Prime Minister wants all pushing by the opposition to get decisions to end. Do you know what he really wants? He wants a quiet, silent, effective,

[Mr. Woolliams.]

confidential dictatorship. That is what the Prime Minister wants.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: He wants his government to operate like a submarine, to hide at the bottom of the sea and surface only for show. That is what he wants.

Some hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: What is his motive? You often have to go to a man's own words to find out his true motive and his true reason. I am told through the grapevine of the backbenchers in the Liberal party, among whom I hope I will always have many friends, that rule 16-A, through which control can be exercised over committees because the house leader can say how long a matter can stay in committee, is the Prime Minister's baby and that the house leader would really like at this stage to rock it to sleep.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had not wished to interrupt the hon. member. I am just calling the house to order.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. This is what the Prime Minister said on February 13 when he wrote that famous article in *Cité Libre*—

An hon. Member: What year.

Mr. Woolliams: 1963. These are his words. He has never denied them. They are interesting. They are not my words. He asked the question, what is the political philosophy of the Liberal party? At that time he was not a Liberal. He was looking around.

An hon. Member: He smartened up.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, he did, because this is their philosophy. They are now performing according to the philosophy which the Prime Minister said the Liberal party had. He asked this question and the reply he gave was:

Say anything, think anything you like. But put us in power, because we are best fitted to govern.

Those words are exactly what the new rules mean in reference to the two matters I have mentioned. As I have said, we are for reform but we are against closure before a debate starts and we are against taking away