

Procedure and Organization

faith with the people if we do not give the Official Opposition its full responsibility in comparison with the two minor parties.

During the debate on the omnibus Criminal Code bill we listened for weeks to the tedious and useless repetition of the Cr ditiste filibuster. Just last week the other small party, the N.D.P., caused the waste of a total evening session by calling for a quorum count during the private members hour and then withdrawing themselves from the count. I can hardly comprehend an official opposition being so irresponsible as to waste time by destroying an evening. It is equivalent to a self-inflicted thrombosis in the life blood of parliament.

Then what should be done? There is a simple answer. I put the challenge squarely to the Official Opposition.

An hon. Member: Put it to yourself first.

An hon. Member: Who are you trying to kid?

Mr. Chappell: As 75B is drafted now the two minor parties can agree with the government. Then there can be an allotment of time. Why should we not add there that if the Official Opposition agrees with the government, that is it. Then there can be agreement. I say this with respect. The important thing is that the Official Opposition and the government would constantly share the responsibility concerning whether we would ever use 75c. The house leader for the Liberals and the house leader for the Progressive Conservatives would agree; they would have to agree because if they did not agree they would be called to account by the press who would ask whether the government house leader was unreasonable or whether the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was unreasonable. The Canadian public would constantly judge which one was unreasonable and made it necessary for 75c to be invoked. I submit that both being in a position of responsibility they would agree and seldom would 75c have to be invoked.

In any even 75c, at least from my study of it, is not so terribly vicious. It is a form of closure but I submit it is mild and there is an abundance of safeguards built into it. I think it is wrong that the Official Opposition does not have a position of responsibility here. Either they agree with the government on time allotment and that is it, or they say no and face the responsibility of forcing the government to use 75c. I cannot imagine the two

minor parties not welcoming the Official Opposition having that responsibility.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house listened to the suggestion just made by the hon. gentleman and gave it the attention it deserves. It amazes me that an hon. member of the Liberal party would cast aspersions on the N.D.P., the former C.C.F., and speak of that party in such disparaging tones, because they were the nursery which gave the present government its Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and two ministers. That is an attitude which does not indicate that spirit of compassion and consideration which I would have expected of the hon. gentleman. I am sure he could not have been speaking on behalf of the Liberal party for certainly such views border on heresy of the worst kind.

Now, sir, I do not intend to traverse the ground which has been gone over during the last few days. I took the government at its word, very much in the spirit of the Revelation, "I, John, saw a new heaven and a new earth". This government was in power and all was well. The house was going to adjourn on, I believe, June 27.

Mr. Stanfield: June 26.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Everything indicated that conclusion. Then at the last moment that pathological disease that has affected the Liberal party for a period now of 13 years evidenced itself and along came the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), a man whom one would never dream would try to destroy or participate in destroying this institution. He occupies a high position. You can always find an appropriate reference to Shakespeare. As I look at that hon. gentleman I think of these words of Shakespeare:

—but man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assur'd,
His glory's essence, like an angry ape.

It is now the minister's turn to laugh again.

● (3:50 p.m.)

Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.

I cannot understand this government. I find it difficult to recognize in a government a desire on the part of its members to destroy this institution. What is the reasoning for this? I ask this of the ministers and I am faced by a galaxy of two—two ministers sitting across the corridor when parliament is discussing a matter that, if carried into effect,