

Science Council

The hon. gentleman did not answer the question asked of him by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) about what had happened to participatory democracy. This, of course, goes back to P.E. 1968—"pre-election 1968". We have heard very little and seen even less of participatory democracy, in the sense of providing open information of a type to which this House and the country are entitled, since that election.

The great respect that I have for the hon. gentleman has been heightened by the fact that he was able to read his statement with a straight face. It was sufficient to drive my honourable and distinguished colleague for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) out of the House; I do not think he could stand any more of it.

Mr. Forest: The hon. member will admit that I had some good authorities.

Mr. Baldwin: The authorities which the hon. member quoted might well have been good a number of years ago, but it is obvious that the people who wrote these dicta, these memoranda, never contemplated a government such as that headed by the right hon. gentleman at the present time, a government that is greedy, avaricious, grasping for power, secretive, incapable of producing the free and open society that we must have.

In today's issue of the *Ottawa Citizen*, a paper which notably does not frown frequently upon the present government, there is a statement to the effect that the other place is considering establishing a committee to ride herd over and to scrutinize just such actions as those which have been complained of—this type of directive, this method of secrecy, this governing by order in council.

In this regard, I have often made mention of a very good report, a non-partisan, unanimous report, which was brought in on the last day of the last session ending in October last year dealing with this same sort of issue. This report was received by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and all government members with hosannas. This report was going to create the open government system in Canada and would make sure that the government would be regulated and controlled and that Parliament would be supreme. What utter bilge! That committee report has been buried, and as I said the other day we will probably never see it again. This is why those honourable and distinguished ornaments in the other

place have now seen fit to assert, as I hope they will continue to assert, their intention of taking up where the committee report that has been buried left off.

The rules referred to in the memorandum read by the parliamentary secretary were good and valid rules at the time, but they do not prevail with a government such as this which now has at its command the exercise of such a vast potential of uncontrolled and unchallengeable power. For this reason, if ever there was a government that must be open and must be compelled to divulge information, facts and documents which possibly under other circumstances I would hesitate to demand, it is this government.

To conclude on this particular issue, I note that the hon. member who moved the motion seeks a copy of the November 4, 1968 letter by the Prime Minister of Canada to the chairman of the Science Council of Canada, as mentioned in the third annual report of the Science Council. If documents are not going to be used or made available, then they should not be the subject of comment in publications which are open to examination by the public and the members of this House. The letter has been commented upon, and although I have read the third annual report of the science council I do not recall the actual terms of it. However, if they saw fit to comment on that letter, there is no reason in the world why the letter should not now be made available. I certainly feel I, for one, intend to support the motion presented by the hon. member.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, like the previous speaker, I listened with some degree of amusement but also with some degree of concern to the reasons given by the government spokesmen for not producing the letter referred to in this motion. It seems to me what really has been given here is the old standard argument found in text books on political science some years ago. I was perhaps most dismayed to hear the reference to John Stuart Mill. There is a certain degree of irony in the reference to John Stuart Mill. The first aspect of this is that in the history of the English speaking peoples he will certainly be regarded as the distinguished liberal—small "l"—who dedicated his life almost entirely to the pursuit of free and open discussion and the implementation of civilized and decent legislation. To hear his name quoted in the context of a