

*Procedure and Organization***AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was referring to the Liberal government as stupid, undemocratic and dictatorial. I said they were looking back to former Liberal governments and following the worst possible examples. I was about to refer to the legislation brought before the house with respect to our defences and the unification of the armed forces. I do not wish to be critical of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), who until very recently seemed to be filling that position with dignity and honour. However, he seems to have backed away from the proposition he enunciated earlier.

With regard to the unification of the armed forces and what the legislation was supposed to do, I would point out that not long after the government took office the direction was suddenly switched and we found the Department of National Defence trying to set up a segregated force for this country. The department was trying to establish segregated crews for some of the ships in our navy, and most recently it tried to set up separate squadrons within our air division. This raises a very interesting question and one which the minister will perhaps answer in the very near future, that is, have there been resignations by French speaking Canadians who do not agree with the principle of segregating the French speaking members of the armed forces?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is now in the house and I think it would be in order to congratulate him on his effort to hold down inflation. This is further proof that—

**Mr. Gibson:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I submit that what the hon. member is now saying has nothing whatsoever to do with the rules. He should resume his seat, because he is not dealing with the rules.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) is aware that we are dealing with an amendment to a committee report in respect of procedure. I invite him to restrict his remarks to that subject, as I invite all hon. members to confine their remarks to the matter before the house.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that the hon. member was hit with enough bricks this afternoon. When  
[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

dealing with the rules, it is absolutely necessary that we refer to the people who have tried to impose the rules on the house; therefore, we must deal with the government, which is responsible for the rules. I was dealing with the government, and see no reason why the hon. member should take exception to my singling out the generous Secretary of State for External Affairs, despite the fact that the Prime Minister has referred to him as the minister of foreign affairs, as has the minister himself. I was in the process of congratulating the minister for his effort to hold down inflation. I remind him that he has drawn to my attention how easy it is to entertain idiots.

All hon. members should ask themselves this question in respect of proposed rule 75c: Since the Prime Minister is the author of programming and so-called efficiency, why does he not participate in the debate? What has happened to the principle that Canadians should participate in every way, shape and form in the business of government? The Prime Minister has allowed the house leader to take the brunt of the blame in this regard. He is responsible for the attitude of Liberal members toward their house leader, who is no longer looked to for leadership but is pitied for his stupidity. To realize this we have only to recall a remark made by a member of the house leader's party, who today stated that if he were house leader for ten minutes he could clear up this matter.

This is the type of conversation that we hear in the cafeteria, the hallways and elevators. The house leader is bearing the brunt in this respect because of the stupidity of a Prime Minister who said we would have participatory democracy and then ran off to the west. The Prime Minister said his trip to the west was more important than listening to a stupid filibuster. He did not follow up his good intentions in this regard, because last evening in an interview on national television, when asked what he hoped to accomplish in the west he said, "Nothing". It is obvious that the western farmer will gain nothing from the Prime Minister's trip. This is also evident from the arrogant attitude of the house leader, who this afternoon was the only person that refused unanimous consent to debate the crisis facing western Canada. I repeat that he was the only member in the house who objected to discussing the plight of the western farmer.

**An hon. Member:** Nonsense.