

agreements. This constitutes an extremely poor exercise in obfuscation. The agreements entered into during the administration of Messrs. St. Laurent and Diefenbaker were in keeping with the policies of the times. We were already allied with the United States when we entered into consultative agreements with them. We were already endeavouring to expand trade and other relations with Japan when agreement was reached on the Canada-Japan Ministerial Committee. There was nothing controversial about the Mexican agreement brought about by the exchange of notes in 1968. Such is not the case with this protocol. It must be considered in the light of the illuminating commentaries of the Prime Minister.

It is quite obvious that insinuations with regard to our independence and how it is menaced, to the overpowering United States presence on this continent, and to the economic, cultural and military threat which the United States represents, were calculated to indicate a new course to be followed in our international relations. What we have now is a double alignment, which in some quarters, with plenty of justification, may be looked upon as a doublecross.

This protocol, the events which surrounded its signing, and the comments upon it which issued forth from the mouth of our Prime Minister, will gain us no real friends and risk alienating devoted allies.

**Hon. Mr. Thompson:** I should like to ask the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Flynn) a question. I am, as he probably recognizes, from Ireland. I was born in Ireland, and I look at the sad plight of that country and think of the long memories of its people in connection with Dragheda and Wexford, with Cromwell, always reaching back into history. Senator Flynn referred to Senator Martin and the anti-communist posture. Is there a period when we start to work with people? Is there a time when we should be trying to work with people, despite the sins, the terrible sins, that were done in the past?

**Hon. Mr. Flynn:** I am not opposed to promoting good relations with the U.S.S.R., and I think that when I came back from my trip there last year I was quite clear on that point. I am not against it. What I have been criticizing with regard to this protocol is the manner in which it was drafted and the misunderstanding which may result therefrom. I was not at all critical of the idea of improving relations with the U.S.S.R., and I do not think there is anything in what I said to suggest that.

**Hon. Mr. Yuzyk:** Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate I should like to adjourn this debate until after the next item on the Order Paper has been dealt with. I have discussed the matter with the two Whips, and in order to allow Senator O'Leary to make his speech I should like to defer my speech until immediately after that item.

**Hon. Mr. Martin:** So that we can go on with legislation.

[Hon. Mr. Flynn.]

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, is it agreed that Order No. 1 should be reverted to immediately after we have disposed of the next order?

**Hon. Senators:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION BILL

### SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

Leave having been given to proceed to Order No. 4:

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, June 1, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West) for the second reading of Bill C-207, respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto.

**Hon. Mr. Grattan O'Leary:** Honourable senators, this bill is called an omnibus bill. It is a sort of package deal, which I think most of us in this house and in the other place should dislike and, if we could, reject. I have read the bill fairly carefully. There are some things in it that I believe are good and that I would like to support, but there are other things in it that I dislike and that I would not like to support. Why should I be asked to vote for the whole thing in one package? Why should I be compelled to accept things to which I object just because I have to vote for some things in which I believe?

I listened the other day to Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) introducing the bill. I am always interested in Senator Connolly's speeches, because they are delivered with scholarship and understanding, and usually with great lucidity. But I seemed to detect a bit of boredom in the speech he delivered the other day. In fact, in his concluding remarks he clearly indicated that he had not been supplied with facts that would justify his giving his benediction to the bill. However, I am perfectly satisfied to proceed with a bill that does not get full benediction from the other side.

In dealing with the particular matter I shall try to discuss, namely, ministers of state, I suppose it could be argued that the other place has a perfect right to determine its procedures and its characters as it pleases, since the special character of the changes being made affecting the other place do not in fact affect this part of Parliament. What I object to in this bill is contained in clauses 13 to 15. What I find a bit disturbing, and what I think we should all find disturbing, is the tendency towards big government. We live in an age when an obsession with bigness seems to determine many of the actions taken by government. We have big government, big labour, big business, big highways, big this and big that—what somebody has called "giantism".

The clauses permitting the creation of ministers of state curiously enough provide that these ministers can be created without debate in the House of Commons. The Government says that under this clause which begins, "Where it appears to the Governor in Council that the requirements for formulating and developing new and comprehensive policies . . .", a new minister is to be appointed, and the House of Commons, the other branch of the Parliament, is not even permitted to debate the