

one to come out with a reasoned sales pitch, to explain to me why I should support this measure.

If the government backbenchers believe in this thing they should be prepared to stand up and be counted. They should say we should do it for this reason, that reason or the other reason. But has that happened yet? I ask you to read the debates. The best interjection from the government side so far was by the President of the Treasury Board last Thursday. At that time he told me to read the bill. I thought that was rather profound, coming from him. I have read the bill, and I have read the speeches made on it. The only contribution from the government side has been to point out that patronage exists in other legislatures. In my opinion, that is a very weak argument. Let us admit that it does exist in other places. Does that make it right for us? I think not.

The only contribution by the hon. member for Peterborough, for whom I have the highest regard and respect for his academic background, his integrity, and for his being a former deputy speaker, was to point out that in 1959 a resolution regarding parliamentary secretaries was introduced in this House. I am not going to stoop to that type of nit-picking, but let the record show that that bill in 1959 replaced a previous act that had been brought in by a Liberal government. But this is specious argument, and I don't like it. On Thursday last, the hon. member for Mercier made a sincere intervention in the debate. He did not need to, but he apologized for his English. I salute him, Mr. Chairman. His remarks were well made. I sincerely wish I could do as well in his language as he did in mine.

I am astounded that government members have given so few reasons to support the bill. But there was one exception. We all know that the hon. member for York East is an independent thinker. I admire his intellect. I do not always agree with him, but I respect his judgment. As recorded at page 4798 of *Hansard* he said:

This bill proposes to create a few or any number of ministers of state.

He can see the loopholes in it. He went on to point out how pessimistic he was about Parliament, and as recorded later on the same page he said:

No hon. gentlemen opposite can say that he really has the power to change anything, and none of us on this side can say it either.

I cannot share his pessimism about the way this institution works. I was not sent here to give up my right to be heard on behalf of the people of Lambton-Kent, and to try to make changes. I was not sent here to be a rubber stamp to an arrogant government run by one man. Attitudes here, Mr. Chairman, are appalling. One voice here last week was heard to say, "We've got a winner." He was probably referring to the Prime Minister. I say to hon. members opposite: don't let it go to your heads, boys, because under our system of representation, which incidentally, Mr. Chairman, is another subject—

**Mr. Deachman:** Would the hon. member permit a question with regard to a point he has made?

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

**Mr. McCutcheon:** As soon as I conclude my remarks I will be happy to answer questions from the hon. gentleman.

**Mr. Deachman:** This is just a factual point. I think he made an error, and I believe the hon. member might like to explain it if I am incorrect. He said that the bill would create any number—

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard):** Order. Does the hon. member for Lambton-Kent wish to accept the question?

**Mr. McCutcheon:** I told the hon. gentleman I would be prepared to accept questions from him at the conclusion of my remarks. I only have 20 minutes. I was saying that under our system of representation—

• (4:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Jerome:** A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard):** The hon. member for Sudbury on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Jerome:** In his contribution to the debate on this clause, the hon. member has said that any number of ministries of state may be created or any number of ministers of state may be appointed. Clause 17 of the bill reads:

The Governor in Council shall not, pursuant to section 14, establish ministries of state so that there are more than five such ministries in existence at any one time.

I wonder if the hon. member would not admit that this does not provide for "any number" but provides for a specific number only and that he would be in error—

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard):** I think the hon. member is entitled to make his contribution, and if any other hon. member wants to deny his allegations or correct them it can be done in a future speech.

**Mr. McCutcheon:** Mr. Chairman, this intervention is typical and is just a stalling tactic. I would refer the hon. gentleman to the remarks I have made, and I would further refer him to clause 23 to see how that relates to the clause he quoted. But may I continue?

Our system of representation has given the government a majority, but I would like hon. members opposite to remember that in the 1968 election, 4,375,115 people voted against this government while 3,609,539 voted for it. I ask, therefore, who has the greatest responsibility, government members or members in opposition who have tried their best to represent the majority? I say through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members opposite, "Don't be so cocksure of yourselves; remember you don't have the divine right to rule." We on this side of the House represent a lot of people as well.

Last Thursday night, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Kitchener made a spirited intervention in this debate. His remarks in support of this section of the bill can be found on page 4835 of *Hansard*. He said, "Patronage is very evident in the province of Ontario." He went on to