

Procedure and Organization

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that after one year of a new parliament the government is permitting this session to end on such a sour note. It could have co-operation in the house right to the end, just as it has had co-operation from the time we gathered here after the election last year. As a matter of fact, it has been one of the most productive sessions ever enjoyed by a Canadian parliament. I have consulted with our law officer, Dr. Ollivier, who tells me that his biggest problem now is whether they are going to print the statutes we have passed during this session in one or two volumes, so great has been our productivity.

Why are we now meeting a demand from the government for a rule such as 75c? Later on if I have time and the opportunity to use my full time—I will use that time and come back on another occasion as long as we are here—I will outline the co-operation we have given.

This whole matter has been scouted before, and it is obvious to everyone here, as I think it is becoming obvious to all Canadians, that nothing has been left undone that we should be doing before we recess for the summer. There is legislation on the order paper, some of which was introduced in order that the public might get a look at it, and some of which has been left on the order paper for reasons only known to the government.

Great occasions bring forth great speeches. Of all those I have listened to during this debate, and when the topic involves an issue that is fundamental one can expect that good speeches will be made, I think the accolade should be given to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). That hon. member has been in this house since 1940, with a short hiatus. In other words, he is marking a quarter century of service to his country in this institution. It ill behoves this parliament that a person who did not even have the grace to listen to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and other members who have taken part in this debate, should label the message of that hon. member as sheer hypocrisy. That is what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has done.

The Prime Minister has not stayed to listen to the debate up to this time, and of course he will not be here to listen to us this week. Perhaps he will have to listen next week or the week after, as long as something such as 75c is before us. Let us look on the year we have gone through. We have had more committees and more committee meetings than ever before. More legislation has been pro-

[Mr. Peddle.]

duced than ever before. Members have been working to the extent that they have had almost no spare time, particularly those who served on two or three committees. We realize the amount we have done, but we must know that the committees cannot work efficiently unless members of the opposition work as hard as members of the government. The record has been a good one for both the opposition and the government. We hammered away at the proposed legislation and we got through it. Some of the committees were not all they should have been and others were absolutely superb. They turned in a job of which we should be proud.

Now, in the final moments of the session, why should whatever carrots were held out before us to lure us on be withdrawn and a whip applied instead. What kind of reasoning is that, and what kind of people are directing the affairs of a once great political party who could believe this is a proper tactic to use in the House of Commons? What kind of people are these who could graciously withdraw rule 16A, which we were considering before Christmas, and then bring it back as a Frankenstein monster dressed up with a little bit of make-up in order that it will look different, right at the tail end of a session? I suppose they thought we were all tired at this point and after a perfunctory shaking of the fist at this rule we would go our way to visit our constituencies. We will not do that until 75c is slain and is as dead as 16A. It must be slain in the same way.

The latest issue of the *New Yorker* contains an imaginative article about our Prime Minister. I should like to quote something he is reputed to have told a young reporter, Miss Edith Iglauer. The article quotes the Prime Minister as having said:

I've always dreamt of a society where each person should be able to fulfill himself to the extent of his capabilities as a human being, a society where inhibitions to equality would be eradicated. This means providing individual freedoms—

● (9:30 p.m.)

Individual freedoms to whom? This is the thought that puzzled me when I read this sugar-coated confection in the *New Yorker* magazine. This article is not critical at all. It is not even a good, basic piece of reporting, because it does not attempt to examine all of the rather interesting facets of our Prime Minister. I can only conclude that Miss Edith Iglauer is one of that stable of neurotic young women who are rapidly becoming the reporting staff of the *New Yorker* magazine. During this interview she was having either dinner