

*Procedure and Organization*

the government has no legislation of any kind before this house except the closure rule, 75c. There is no urgent legislation waiting, because the time of adjournment had been set by agreement.

I am amazed at the audacity of the government. What is their purpose? What is the motive behind this? The government set the time for the adjournment of the house and then turned around and brought in this joker, closure, thinking they had a submissive parliament. I think they are beginning now to realize they do not have a submissive parliament. I wonder what the Prime Minister wants now. Last December, as pointed out very ably by the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Stanfield), the leader of the N.D.P. and the leader of the Cr ditiste, when clause 16A was being considered there were many procedural changes adopted to speed up the work of the house. At that time the government brought in this joker clause. We did not go for it in December and we will not go for it in July. I wonder what the purpose is behind this, because last December the Prime Minister said he did not expect the joker clause to be adopted in any event, but that he wanted to get the other clauses through. That was the lever he used. What is the sinister purpose now? He has not taken parliament into his confidence. What can we expect?

• (3:40 p.m.)

People are getting upset and alarmed about this attempted change. Did he think this was a good time to attempt this change, when United States astronauts are going to land on the moon, and when hundreds of thousands of people are at their summer cottages, not seeing newspapers or watching the news media? Was that his thought, and is that what is behind this? What measure does he expect to bring in, respecting which he intends to use this sinister clause? That is the whole crux of the matter. How can we trust him? Even the students at universities are alarmed. They do not believe in this rule. I have here the *Ottawa Journal* for today, July 16, in which it is stated:

Two University of Ottawa students' council executives have mounted a Canada-wide public opinion campaign against controversial rule 75c which would limit debate in the House of Commons.

Students' council president Allan Rock, vice-president Hugh Segal and about ten volunteers worked late Tuesday night preparing petitions to be sent to all Canadian university campuses. They are asking for the support of the public and students. The students hope to have at least 5,000 signatures within a week.

29180—714½

Mr. Rock said the apathy of Canadians in general over the proposed debate limiting rule has been "appalling" and now it looks as though the matter may be settled by closure.

"It is time we did something about it" he said.

It is not much wonder that students are alarmed. One can become alarmed sitting in this chamber because we are not even getting this feeling across the chamber to the government members. The students suggest it is about time we did something about this proposal. The article then continues:

"We didn't start earlier on this thing because we didn't think there was the slightest possibility the rule would ever pass."

The students have set up an organization called "Students for Free Parliament" to direct the cross-country protest effort.

"The least we can hope for is postponement of a Commons vote on the rule until fall to give people more time to think about it."

In Ottawa the petition will be circulated on both U of O and Carleton university campuses. Write-in signatures will also be accepted if mailed to students council within the next few days.

I have a high regard for students. They value liberty. They are studying history and political science. They know the facts. When the Prime Minister suggested this rule change last December, he was just using it as a lever.

Let us look at the editorial page of today's *Ottawa Journal* in an attempt to find out what this man is trying to do with parliament. The editorial reads:

Eclectic is an interesting word—

Apparently this is a reference to an article in the *New Yorker* magazine in which the Prime Minister was quoted as describing himself as "very eclectic". Apparently this is a new word, but what does it mean? The editorial then goes on to quote what the Prime Minister said:

"I bet many people in my position have read more than I have in the field of history and economics. I have probably read more Dostoevsky, Stendahl and Tolstoy than the average statesman and less of Keynes, Mill and Marx."

Eclectic it is; but right now his critics say we need a little more Keynes and a little less Stendahl.

One begins to wonder whether sophism is at work again. Is it fair to assume that the Prime Minister is reacting in the same way he did last December? Perhaps for reasons of sophism he wants this closure rule adopted in order that he can put through other measures he could not get through otherwise. Perhaps this involves a matter of philosophy, whereas we are the masters of this house. We must assume that sophism is at work again. What will this do to parliament?