

*Procedure and Organization*

this country must govern with parliament and within parliament are now told that, to all intents and purposes, we will be governed without parliament. We in this party, Mr. Speaker, and members in all parties on this side of the house, refuse to accept and will refuse to accept this proposition for as long as we are here.

Those on the government benches who talked freely and fully not too many months ago of government by dialogue have now opted for government by monologue. I will take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, before the supper adjournment I was indicating in a general way how shocked I and many others in this house were this afternoon to hear the announcement the government house leader made. What we are witnessing, quite likely, is part and parcel of the passing of a free parliament. The Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) role is that of an undertaker, and that of his cabinet colleagues of pall bearers. Tomorrow we shall see the last act played out, and we shall all be witnesses at the wake.

Many in the country have wondered what we have been doing for the past month. The attention of our people to a large measure, understandably, has been directed to the fantastic space achievement of the last few days. They noticed parliament and took note of this debate only a few days ago after the Prime Minister made the inadvertent suggestion that he had better things to do than listen to a stupid filibuster. Some hon. members at that point became disturbed at the idea that, in referring to this debate as a stupid filibuster, he was attributing a motive to some hon. members of the house. Although it may not be unparliamentary for the Prime Minister to call a filibuster stupid, I think we have discovered that his words were not really meant to refer to a filibuster as much as to parliament itself. We have seen very real evidence in this debate that this government has become tired of dealing with parliament and wishes to be done with it.

The government has talked about negotiation. After the government house leader received permission to revert to motions this afternoon, he spoke about the advances the government had made in working out some kind of solution. He seemed to think it strange that by today we had not come to some sort of agreement. Is that his understanding of reasonable negotiations? They were not initiated by him last Thursday but by other hon. members. If one can judge from the relatively small amount of time the government has been willing to spend on negotiations, it is not difficult to arrive at the conclusion that the government has been preparing for some time to carry out the action it announced today it will carry out.

**Mr. Bell:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** The slogan we heard not too many months ago was "participatory democracy". All the available evidence shows that either the Prime Minister does not understand what participatory democracy is, or that he cannot be bothered with it. Time and again when important questions or important issues have been directed to him, he has resorted to the technique of posing other questions rather than giving answers. That may be an excellent classroom technique but does nothing to promote those useful exchanges that must take place between a leader and the people. Part of his classroom technique, and here the Prime Minister has demonstrated his debating skill, has been to reduce the matter before him to the point of *reductio ad absurdum*. He has set up straw men to be knocked down. This time he cannot be bothered going through these exercises. This time he wants to muzzle parliament.

Before the government house leader introduced the closure motion I had thought that he and the Prime Minister did not really understand what they meant when they talked about participatory democracy. Now, I save come to the sad conclusion that, instead of not understanding that term, they did not really mean it.

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

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** One of the hallmarks of an effective parliament down through the years has been the mutual respect with which hon. members on either side of the house have regarded each other. Surely, any reasonable leader realizes that men in this forum will act reasonably. Tonight the government is trying to say that reasonable.