

*Procedure and Organization*

the greatness of its past, he ended up with these words:

It goes without saying that any proposal for procedural reform must assist both sides of this house to function more efficiently.

Is that what is going to happen if this rule comes into effect; that the opposition is going to be able to function more efficiently? He talks about hypocrisy. There was hypocrisy then, and there is now. All of this is happening while he is pretending that this proposed rule is to bring about a strengthening of parliament. Parliament is being undermined and eroded.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The three who are gathered together and are united in this aim are those the Liberal party took over holus-bolus from the N.D.P.-C.C.F. The house will remember that early last year we saw the attitude of the government of Canada as revealed by the Prime Minister. This was after the government had been defeated. The Prime Minister was then minister of justice. The government was defeated. The opposition gave it opportunities for extra days, and so on. If the government had then gone to the country, as it should in carrying out its constitutional responsibility, it would not be in the position it is today. What did the Prime Minister say when he was minister of justice? These were his words:

We are the masters of this chamber. We decide that we are the government.

I repeat, "We are the masters". As that statement finally appeared in the printing of the French translation, it read:

We are the masters of this chamber in the sense that we should manage its business.

In the English version it read:

We are masters of the house in the sense that we have to conduct the affairs of government.

If the statement "We are masters of the house" had been made in the mother of parliaments, it would have brought such a degree of resentment on the part of the government and opposition that it would have had to be withdrawn. This is the philosophy behind proposed rule 75c, namely, "We are the masters".

I quote from another minister to indicate the attitude of the government. These are the words of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), who received notice that I was going to deal with him. He is the conscience of the Prime Minister and the Liberal government

of today. He is the man who represents the quintessence of the concept, "We are your masters". Very recently he was interviewed by Nathan Cohen on "Twenty Million Questions". I should like to read what this minister of the Crown said, because it indicates the attitude of the government when the Prime Minister says, "We are your masters. You over there are stupid. You have not the right to speak. We do not agree with you". These are the words of the Secretary of State:

I was sitting in the house and listening to these people and I said: "if only the majority of Canadians could hear this nonsense being spoken openly as I hear it tonight, they would see how absurd it is".

These are our masters! He then went on to say that it was nonsensical. Mr. Cohen asked, "What makes their views nonsensical?" The answer was, "Because they are talking nonsense". The minister then revealed himself clearly in these words:

This is a personal judgment, but I make personal judgments and I think I'm right usually when I make them.

There is the picture: the Prime Minister says, "We are the masters" and the Secretary of State says, "They talk nonsense". It must be shocking to the finer sensibilities of those who wander in the intellectual greatness of ivory towers to have to listen to opposition members advancing their views. It was pointed out that the Secretary of State is now responsible for the C.B.C., the National Film Board, the Canada Council, the National Gallery, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

Can you imagine a man having this power and those views? I will mention what he said about the C.B.C. He made it very clear where he stands with regard to that corporation. This is the man who was going to abolish the Queen. This is the man who voted for the principle of a republic. He does not hide the fact that this is where he stands. He said:

Now, with the present management of the C.B.C. I must say that I can discuss with them very freely and I feel no resistance and (that) I feel that I'm in the company of people who want basically the same things that I want myself to achieve.

Is that not a frightful proposition? I have been away from the House of Commons. When I am away I always record my absence. I have been away because I trusted this government to do what it said it would. The