

*Procedure and Organization*

being elected leader of his party, he has made few contributions to debate except for statements made on motions. Immediately after routine proceedings are finished he gets up and leaves the house for other business, supposedly. In fact, since being elected to this chamber in 1965 he has made few contributions in this chamber. We were both in the same class that was elected here, so to speak, only he advanced, perhaps too quickly, because he has not learned what parliament is all about. I will not quote from his few contributions in this house. Having been elected in 1965, he first became a parliamentary secretary and then took the highest job in the land. Tonight, having made his contribution to the debate that some experienced parliamentarians say is the most important debate that will come up in the life of this parliament, the Prime Minister has left the chamber.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. The opposition is united, man to man, as no opposition has been united since I came to parliament in 1965. We are in favour of change; we are in favour of the majority taking its responsibility on legislative items. But let there be no mistake about this, Mr. Speaker. The just society now means "just numbers". If you have a majority of numbers you can put anything through. The opposition, having agreed to rule changes in 1965 and in December of last year in addition to agreeing to adopt proposed rules 75A and 75B which, if adopted, would mean that there would be little likelihood of a filibuster, now stands united as it has never been united possibly since 1956. Not only did the Prime Minister swallow his principles today; but the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) has suddenly been resurrected to contribute to the debate for the first time in seven months. The last time he used his recognized talent for debate was in the rules debate last December. He has been on notice since then. He was resurrected, gave a definition and perhaps will not be heard from after this debate.

• (9:20 p.m.)

We, on this side, are left with this man who talked about dialogue, participation and communication. He has destroyed the meaning of all those words by misleading, mistating and misrepresenting the opposition. The opposition is in favour of change, in favour of the majority ruling on legislative items and of assuming its responsibility under closure, but

this, Mr. Speaker, is closure on a closure rule of this institution.

In the criminal sense this is not only rape, but it is indecent assault compounding the act of rape. Dialogue is no longer the word. It is dictate! Participation is no longer the word. It is now program or programming procedures. Communicate is no longer the word. It is closure when you cannot get your own way by any other means.

This is a sad day for parliament, Mr. Speaker. I was elected to this house in 1965. I shared some of the aspiration of the many new members who came into this house after 1968. There are 64 new members opposite, 17 in our party, 9 in the New Democratic Party and 6 Cr ditistes. This makes a total of 96 new faces in this parliament. I am in a little better position to judge this debate than the 96 new members because I was in the class of 1965, as was the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I came into this house at the end of an old era which was moving off the political scene. This was the era of Mr. Pearson and Mr. Diefenbaker, both of whom contributed much to Canada.

We now have two new leaders, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Stanfield. This was to be the new age. I shared with those 96 new members the hope and anticipation that there would be a new day. When I listened to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) and the Prime Minister in his straining of logic and reason—he is supposed to be a man of logic and reason—trying to justify an ill-conceived rule which had been improperly drawn being forced upon a parliament in an autocratic and inexcusable manner, I came to the conclusion that the era of 1965 was a piece of cake compared to what it is going to be in the years ahead. That is, unless the government minimizes, clarifies and retreats from Rule 75c which is not a legislative item.

This is not a reasonable use of closure. It is the first time I have heard of closure being imposed on a debate on rules changes. After all the energy and animation used by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration this afternoon in telling us what dear old merry England was doing and how debate in that Parliament had been shortened from one day to two hours, I asked the question, was closure used? The minister knew the question was coming, and yet he never answered it. He could not answer it. All I can infer from his convoluted answer, which I know is correct, is that they did not use closure to ramrod the new rules into that parliament. I do not