If this is a new government, it is not yet a reformed government, since it has the same old mentality that imposed taxation by radio and in many ways heaped contempt upon parliament.

Let me turn for a moment to a high authority, to no less a person than the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). Concerning this government and its attitude to such matters, he spoke words from which hon. members opposite would do well to profit. I will quote, Mr. Speaker, from a speech of the hon. and esteemed member for Quebec South, as reported in the Ottawa *Journal* of August 9, 1948. It happens that this speech was delivered before the national convention of the Liberal party. In reviewing some of the things to which I have alluded, the bureaucratic complex of this government and its tyrannical and irresponsible attitude towards the House of Commons, he said this:

> Without the existence of an almost all-powerful bureaucracy, it is unlikely that we would have had budget by radio, restraint of trade by embargoes and prohibitions, bungling of freight rates, and a snarling of interprovincial relations.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that is just what this government has attempted to do.

He says further:

> But to me loss of individual freedom through irresponsible bureaucracy is too high a price to pay even for security.

I ask hon. members of all parties of this house to weigh well the memorable words uttered by the member for Quebec South on that occasion, when he said:

> Since the beginning of this convention there have been hints that from high places from now on all would be well; that things would be different in the future; that we would mend our ways. The pride that could flout a parliamentary caucus or a house of commons quailed before a national convention. But tonight the delegates will be gone, the old pride will return.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the old pride has returned. We have proof of it in this government resolution today.

The old plea of urgency has, of course, been trotted out. I think we have had enough in what the Prime Minister has said to completely disprove this allegation of urgency with respect to the Newfoundland measure.

Where is the sense in the government seriously saying it is imperative that the throne speech debate should not be permitted to proceed—it would probably last two or three weeks—because there would not be time to pass this Newfoundland legislation? Why could not the house have been called two weeks ago? No reason has been given—no reason whatever.

But the Prime Minister was not satisfied with that. When we met here on Wednesday there was tremendous urgency about this Newfoundland business. It was so urgent that it had to be proceeded with on Monday next. The most this government was prepared to permit, by way of rationed time in this chamber to speak in this debate, was Thursday and Friday. Two days to air the grievances of a nation in a parliament in which the new government has not yet proven it possesses the confidence of the house! Two whole days for the assertion of the rights of democracy in this House of Commons before the government steam roller begins to put legislation before the house and sidetrack other forms of discussion!

Suddenly, Mr. Speaker, that urgency began to fade somewhat in view of the snarl into which the government had gotten itself by its attempt to dictate to the house. The Prime Minister then decided that the house might have another week to discuss it. Today he says, and I recall his words, that we would be as far ahead after a week or two of debate on the speech from the throne. Then, why confine the debate on the address to one week if we would be as far ahead after a week or two?

The way in which democracy is functioning in free parliaments and legislatures the world over today is being watched by many people as the race narrows down between the true democratic way of life and the communist totalitarian method. There never was a time when it was so much the duty of members of a free parliament to assert the rights of all its members, if they would value their freedom and the constitutional processes they were elected not only to carry out but to defend.

What would be your attitude, Mr. Speaker, if you were one of those detestable communists, after seeing what was being attempted by the government in this House of Commons today, after hearing the talk about the rights of parliament, about parliament being a place where the grievances of the people are being aired, and where criticism can be leveled at the government without fear of individual retaliation, and then government comes along and decides that it will ration freedom of speech in this chamber? What would be your attitude, Mr. Speaker, if you were a communist? You would say, Is that not a fine sample of democracy? You would say, If that is democracy, then, after all, what is the fundamental difference between it and the totalitarian method?

This is no way for any government to expedite the business of the session. If they want to do that, let them first give this house a free opportunity to express an opinion as to whether or not they possess its confidence.