

*Procedure and Organization*

Trudeau's demand for further rules changes represents another invasion of the shrunken ground of authority and self-respect still held by the members of the Commons, after years of steady attrition.

If imposed, the rules will ensure not only that less will be heard from the opposition but a good deal less from government backbenchers as well. What are they to do with their time?

Given the Prime Minister's distemper the other day, few Liberal members are likely to expose themselves to his charge that all who oppose him are "stupid" or "hypercritical."

And Mr. Macdonald, the Prime Minister's jack-of-all-troubles, has told them, at a recent caucus, not to forget the fact that they are in parliament because they were borne there on the coat-tails of their leader. But the life of a parliamentary acolyte must be hard! It is only too bad that some of them will not say publicly, about now, what they are saying privately.

I do not like to enter into harsh, unkind debate. In my political career I have never developed an instinct to go for the jugular. I do not care where a man's jugular is because I have not the intention of going after it. However, there are certain things one must note and, noting, must react to. I have been wondering in this interesting political phase if there is some elixir of arrogance which is quaffed by members of the present cabinet before or after their meetings. Dicey used to talk about the "endless audacity of elected men" and I think of the presumptuous arrogance of some of those who are ministers of the Crown today.

Is there some cloak of condescension which must be worn by the sacred group who sit at the great table? Even the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), whose administrative actions when they are not failures are fiascos, even he can be arrogant. Do some members miss this arrogance because they are not exposed to the centre of things? Is this why the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) is always such a reasonable, gentlemanly man? Is this why the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) do not possess these attributes, because they are farther away from the new era and the new type of politics? Because I mentioned those two I do not want to suggest I have exhausted the list.

I do not enjoy this sort of debate but I cannot in all conscience find any good or worthy reasons for what is being attempted in 75c.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The convictions I had were made more grim last night as I watched the President of

the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) try to convey to the Canadian people what is going on in this house. I think his performance was shameful—

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

**Mr. Macquarrie:**—and the reason we are not in agreement today. I do not know why such a man was chosen for such an important position as house leader. Where was the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith); where was the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen)? Why could one of these men not have been designated? Not only do they have a knowledge of the rules of the house but also they have the kind of parliamentary maturity which is necessary in dealing with hon. members and which perhaps would have ensured to them success. I suggest with all respect that the designation of the President of the Privy Council for the delicate role of negotiation in a matter of such importance is just about as wise as would be the nomination of Genghis Khan as Moderator of the Presbyterian Church.

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

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** And with the same result.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** I hope I did not hear someone across the way cast aspersions on the Presbyterian Church. Say what you like about me but mind yourself when talking about the Presbyterian Church because I might have to forego my usual role of humble gentility if this should come about. Like my fellow Presbyterian, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert)—you are calling for my confession here—I am angry, I am disturbed, I am anxious and worried about what is happening. But also like the hon. member for Broadview I think perhaps the heaviest emotion I have at the moment is one of sadness.

I say why is this necessary? Why must this vital national institution be so torn and traumatized as it is at the present time? Why do we have these recurring efforts to block free expression of opinion in this chamber? In a day and age when many established institutions are under severe stress and strain why are we not all uniting to buttress and strengthen this one instead of having to fight within ourselves against efforts which would debilitate it?

There are too many things today being assailed by unreasonable anarchists. Surely we should preserve this institution. I should like to say in passing that I do not commend