

*Official Languages*

custody, without the right to counsel and were denied the rights that apply to the average Canadian in accordance with the traditions we inherited.

I must to come to grips immediately with two problems. I am sorry the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is not here at the moment because it shocked the sensibilities of every member of parliament on this, and I am sure the other side of the house, when he said today that because this bill had been examined by a standing committee of the House of Commons the amendments proposed by the government and certain other members were accepted. The bill, therefore, should be merely rubber stamped and nothing should be said from this side of the house.

I want to explode once again, as I will do every time I rise in my place in the years that may remain to me, because the committees set up under the new rules were given tremendous power. They were given the power of parliament. At one time in this house every clause of every bill was examined by the Committee of the Whole House. All members could examine each clause as the bill was piloted through. That power has now been handed to a standing committee of the House of Commons. What applies to other committees also applies to this committee, and that is why it is necessary to move these amendments at this time.

In standing committees, a government chairman governs the committee, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) controls the members of the committee. It is an instrument of the government; no more, no less and no better, as far as jurisdiction is concerned. The Minister of Justice said this afternoon that because this bill was examined carefully by a committee, there can be nothing wrong with it. What the minister meant to say was that the government was going to oppose forcibly these amendments, either by silence, because we appear to be on the side of right, or by voting as a block because their committee, controlled by the Prime Minister, said Canada is going to get this kind of bill. That was a shocking insult to parliament from one of the great lawyers and great brains of our country. It forces me to rise in my place and ask the Minister of Justice if that is really what he meant.

Whose job is more important than the job of hon. members in this house? Their job is to get across to this nation that the procedure in which we are now engaged in parliament is just a procedure to give the appearance

that the right things are being done. The Minister of Justice said today that because this bill had been examined by a committee, a committee controlled by a government chairman who is controlled by the government, that amendments of any importance were moved by the government and government members. The minister said that was good enough and members really have no function here. That was his real message.

I was somewhat shocked to hear a member of the New Democratic Party, for whom I have a lot of respect, oppose the fundamental concern of these amendments. I agree with this statement that the administration of the law depends on the character of the person administering it and his ability to weigh justice in its highest sense. A Commissioner of this type will be necessary if this bill is to be implemented properly in the province of Quebec as well as in those provinces in which French Canadians live and where English speaking Canadians and those of other ethnic origins live. I agree with that, but I remind the hon. member of the N.D.P. that he need only look to Europe in our lifetime. When the rule of law fails to govern and when we rely on the rule of people, the niceties of character or personalities of human beings, what happens to civil rights? I was born in an atmosphere where the Magna Carta hung on the walls of the bedroom, living room, dining room and rumpus room. I cannot accept the hon. member's argument or philosophy.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Woolliams:** As our party's leading speaker said earlier this evening, we already have a man who has been given complete power. Why has he been given this power? I say with all the sincerity I can muster, and with sadness in my heart, that I do not have confidence that this government, governing with this kind of excuse, will not do something I do not want to see happen. I sat with the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) on the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. We saw Mr. Pickersgill pilot a bill through this house. He rushed it, pushed it, and said that we did everything to block its passage. I never believed at that time that Mr. Pickersgill was negotiating with his government and parliament for a \$50,000 a year job to set himself up as the Czar of transportation. I cannot believe that the Secretary of State, who has the kind of reputation and name—