

*Procedure and Organization*

Secretary of State says with regard to the C.B.C.:

—I feel that I'm in the company of people who want basically the same things that I want myself to achieve.

How many reports on the C.B.C. has parliament considered? I have listened to the C.B.C. every night and have not heard anything on this subject; there has been absolute silence. You would not know there was a debate in the house that concerns the future and the greatness of this institution. Not a word has been said on the C.B.C. On the other hand the sycophants who praise the government find their way on to the channels of the C.B.C.—those who say the House of Commons is a bore, those who say there is here needless repetition, those who say this kind of thing should end, those who say parliament should be at the whim of the lust of power-grasping individuals. These people are reported; their statements are given on the C.B.C. Last Sunday, the report from Parliament Hill would indicate that everything here was boring. That is because these people have decided that something must be done to bolster up the government. The Secretary of State also said the trouble with us in parliament is that we have not the knowledge:

—I'm a little sick myself of hearing about understanding when knowledge is not even there. And you can't come to understanding without knowledge.

This is the man who sits over there, controls these various organizations, and says that he finds in the C.B.C. a brotherhood of thought and idealism. Is this one of the reasons why individuals come to our country for the purpose of stirring up trouble? I do not refer to all those who come to this country, but there are people who come here to stir up trouble, and they always seem to be able to find a place on the C.B.C. to voice their propositions to the Canadian people. And when they do not come here because they would be asked to leave, the C.B.C. arranges for their views to be broadcast. One individual spoke over the telephone from the United States; the C.B.C. arranged this. The C.B.C. representative said to him, "We are glad to have your views. Be sure to call me up."

● (4:10 p.m.)

This is what is happening here. The government house leader has said, "Oh, do not be afraid. We will not use this rule, except in 1 per cent of cases. In 99 cases out of 100 we will not use it." I ask what has the government in mind? Why is it endeavouring to

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

foist this on us at this time? What is the purpose, what is the objective? Why the rush? Who wants what?

Over and over again in this house the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the leader of the New Democratic party (Mr. Douglas) and the leader of the Ralliement Cr ditiste (Mr. Caouette) have asked where the government was held up. The government has not been held up. Nothing has been done for the veterans or for the farmers. Oh, yes, the farmers are to have a visitation from on high. The Prime Minister is in western Canada but he is not there to consult the farmers. This attitude, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the government is the attitude of dictators.

This parliament is a sham. The hon. member on this side of the house who preceded me said that there have been changes over the years. This parliament is dead and if we carry on as we have been we shall become undertakers who are about to bury parliament.

It is the government that refuses to place legislation before the house. The opposition cannot propose legislation. Yet the government cannot point to one piece of legislation that is ready to be put before the house. Instead we hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in reply to questions from the Leader of the Opposition say, "We are not going to tell you what is going to happen. It is a secret. Some day we will reveal it." No doubt that will be in the great by and by. When we ask the government what it is going to do, the answer invariably given is, "We are giving thought to the matter." Indeed, it is impossible to understand what the government wants or what it has in mind.

On September 16 when the Prime Minister was speaking about parliament, he said, as reported at page 72 of *Hansard*:

—whether our systems of government have outlived their effectiveness,—

And, sir, he followed with these words:

—whether . . . new institutions are necessary—

What does that mean? Are we to do away with the parliamentary system and adopt the congressional system of government? Is that the new institution?

This government's attitude was demonstrated when on June 24 the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) directed, contrary to the rules of protocol, that no flag was to be flown at half mast over parliament hill in memory of one of the greatest soldiers of our time, and