

*Procedure and Organization*

will not say that 90 per cent is hypocritical and wasteful, and on as little evidence.

• (9:30 p.m.)

My time is moving so fast I can hardly believe it. The other point it has to do with programming, and I am speaking about the President of the Privy Council. Because we personify people, any government that tries to program people will run into the kind of conflict in which we are now involved. You can legislate, organize, consult, compromise and co-operate with people, but you cannot program people. That is the fundamental fallacy of the Liberal government's position. You can program a computer, but this commons has a long way to go before it will become a computer. I can only hope, in the months and weeks before we meet again, this government will appreciate that while we can organize, consult, conciliate and compromise, so long as it tries to use this idea of programming, we will run into conflict. Look at the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). I agree with a lot of things he says. Only yesterday he told us about the rights of collective bargaining. What is the ultimate weapon when the parties cannot come to terms? It is the weapon of the strike. I suggest there is an analogy in his domain.

The Minister of Labour is against compulsory arbitration because he says it takes away from collective bargaining. He has a very valid point and he agrees with me. I say, on a like principle, that in the parliamentary process, 90 per cent of which is dependent upon co-operation or agreement, if there is an insurmountable conflict, then the only weapon the opposition has—it is not the numbers game—is prolonged debate. You can call it what you like, but it is prolonged debate. That is as essential, I suggest, to the parliamentary system as the right of strike is to the collective bargaining and labour-management system. Any parliament or government which fails to recognize that will be in trouble.

With the rules of relevancy Mr. Speaker and with television right outside this chamber, the time limit in respect of debate will automatically be reduced. There is no reason whatsoever to even attempt to have this autocratic 75c. The sad thing is that the scar tissue—let no man doubt this—which has been created by this debate will fester in the ensuing sessions unless some people come to their senses. Some names have been called. I shall not adopt a name calling attitude. I am afraid we have come too close to the philosopher

king concept in respect of 75c. I refer to the government's position that they are the masters and they will govern. Plato, in his "Republic" developed the philosopher king idea. It might have been an efficient way to govern, but it is not the democratic way to govern. So long as we have this philosophy permeating this government this scar tissue that has erupted will grow.

It is a strange paradox that the man who swept in on a tidal wave just a little over a year ago, in this age of consent, by communicating with the young who are so bothered about the establishment and the rules their fathers had, is not going to pay homage to these acts of consent but is going to cut off the right to debate in this supreme parliamentary chamber, this parliament which personifies the people of the land. There is not a provincial legislature which has this rule. I look across the way and see some hon. gentlemen who have been mayors and councillors.

Rule 75c is not a legislative bill. It represents the right of the government to pre-empt how long we will debate a matter. It is this to which we object. Any mayor who ran for office on such a program would be defeated. There are many members here who have contributed their services to school boards. Any school board chairman who tried such a program would be tossed out of office. The university councils and the senates of the universities, which the students are trying to storm, would be in a state of constant uproar such as we have had in the past few days if such a thing were tried.

If anyone wonders about co-operation or compromise, they have only to look at the charade of yesterday when the rules were used to their full maximum. Things bogged down.

In my closing minutes I should like to refer to excerpts from the *New York Times* of November 26, 1922 in the days of Mussolini. There is a heading, "Rome (by wireless to the *New York Times*)."

Then there is a headline, "Near Dictatorship given to Mussolini". Following that there is a subhead, "Premier Dominates House". Then there is a sub-subhead entitled, "Wrings Vote of 275 to 90 from Weary Members". I should like to read this report:

By 225 votes to 90 the Mussolini Government tonight received from the Chamber full powers to adopt any measures it thinks best in all matters pertaining to bureaucratic and financial reforms. These full powers are valid up to Dec. 31, 1923—

The Mussolini Government can now proceed with all the reforms it advocates, quite unhampered by