

increases take place in the field of ministries of state and parliamentary secretaries, since these appointments are for a two-year period 110 of 155 Liberal members will have held a position of some kind from cabinet minister to minister of state to parliamentary secretary. In other words, this Parliament will be dominated by those who hold positions within the pay of the country, over and above their indemnity as members. That can only be destructive of the basic principle of the independence of Parliament.

I am very much concerned about this legislation. It is in the Prime Minister's name, but for some reason the Prime Minister does not see fit to be present when discussions are taking place in respect of a matter which is dangerous to the whole concept of parliamentary sovereignty. I shall begin, Sir, by referring to the revelation made the other evening by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister when, in answer to a matter raised by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants, he said that "the bill gives flexibility and raises a dilemma concerning how much debate we can stand". I have left out some of the additional words. That is the attitude of this government; Parliament is to be subject to flexibility which has become a synonym for political patronage. This action is being taken in order to keep in line back bench members in supporting the government. There can be no other reason for such anxiety to get this legislation through, which is described as being urgent. Parliament is being bamboozled with the introduction of this type of legislation. We want action taken in respect of pollution, but in order to secure that action, in my opinion Parliament is asked to itself to engage in pollution.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** In other words, Parliament is being asked to provide jobs for hungry members who are desirous of holding some title or place, not forgetting that various amounts up to \$15,000, in the case of ministers of state, will be available. There is every opportunity to appoint ministers without portfolio, but to positions only paying \$10,000, and therefore the government decided it would set up another group known as ministers of state.

Then, so far as parliamentary secretaries are concerned, they believe it will not be long before the amount payable to them may be expected to be increased. Last evening the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte condemned this joining together of legislation that Parliament wants with mercenary provisions like this which must be recognized as being a raid on the public treasury for the benefit of a majority. Why is this course taken? Why is Parliament to be treated in this way? Everything is in this particular bill but the kitchen sink!

But there are two provisions in the bill, in this clause and the following one, that possess an unusual attraction for those who up to the present have not had that preference that they had hoped to have. When I look at this bill, I can understand full well how the Prime Minister and some of his ministers must have laughed with cynicism when it was before the cabinet—"Watch us; we can get away with it." At a time when there are hundreds of thousands of people out of employment because

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

of the actions of this government, for members of Parliament to join in increasing their opportunities for service at higher rates of pay is something that cannot be justified.

There are so many hon. members opposite just waiting in the wings. I watch them, Mr. Chairman. But the hon. member for East York is not in their number. He is in the dog house, and the numbers occupying that position are increasing with the passing days. Others look with hope and expectation, and I am just wondering whether or not the provisions of Standing Order 11 may have some application. That Standing Order reads:

No member is entitled to vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested will be disallowed.

You are fortunate, Mr. Chairman, that you do not have to determine this. If perchance that rule is in effect, this bill will be defeated. You can be absolutely sure of that, because as I look over and watch these hopefuls I conclude that even with the increase in positions which this will provide, where 70 per cent of the government members will hold positions of this kind, unless that 70 per cent were voting for it this bill would not pass the House.

I ask myself why is Parliament being treated in this way? I am disquieted by this type of legislation. It is dangerous to the maintenance of Parliament itself when a government has a majority and, being afraid to introduce these two clauses, with provision for ministers of state and an increase in parliamentary secretaries by way of separate amendments to existing legislation, it throws them into a hopper and says Parliament must accept all the bill whether we agree with these provisions or not.

This bill has all the hallmarks of the dictatorship of the majority. I am not going to use the type of language which is now passable in Parliament—I am not used to using words of that type. However, this bill is a fraud and a political swindle on the institution of Parliament, and it cannot be justified in any way. It is designed to place private members supporting the government in a position where they dare not speak out, where they dare not have their own opinions, as four or five of them have had, including the hon. member for East York to whom I have alluded. They dare not speak out because in doing so they will commit suicide. The sword of Damocles is over the head of every member of the Liberal party who dares to take a stand that the government does not like.

This is pushing Parliament around. Sir, I know that skullduggery has been practised for years. This deed of endeavouring to force members of the House to vote for that which they do not want in order to get that which they do, makes a caricature of Parliament. This is legislation that constitutes a squalid subjugation of this institution. I have watched Parliament for a long while. I have a deep regard and affection for this institution. I saw parliament in the darkest days of war but, Sir, in the last two or three years it has been downgraded and degraded for one purpose only, as the hon. member for Pembina said when speaking on this matter, and that is to control the thought of Parliament because the government has a