

I am glad the minister suggested that because it is more applicable having regard to the Prime Minister's conduct in the last day or two.

The first duty of parliament is to remain a parliament, not to become a subservient and ornamental body. Parliament has a right which is certainly paramount to the convenience of the Prime Minister, the right to live.

May I interpolate, it is also superior to the frustration of a prime minister.

It has the duty to defend itself and not to allow anybody to invade its rights and privileges. It is the will of parliament, not that of the government, that is the will of the nation. When the Prime Minister says that he speaks for the whole of the country, he is mistaking the echo of his words for the voice of the Canadian people. It is parliament which is and must remain the authorized exponent of public opinion and of the public will.

And then later on:

The sovereignty of the people is delegated to parliament, not to the executive, and when I say "parliament", it means the minority as well as the majority in parliament.

I have given you the authorities and I am not going to reargue the points which have already been placed before you. However, I do make an appeal to the Prime Minister. This parliament, this institution should be a temple of freedom, not a place where frustration becomes the means whereby rights are swept aside and whereby rules are misinterpreted in order to achieve a temporary advantage. There is no interpretation that anyone can give that there can be further consideration of a clause that has never been considered.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how the word "further" is misinterpreted, the dictionary or any other meaning cannot be contrived to expand it to mean that further can have reference to something that has not yet been done or achieved. The Prime Minister could certainly act even now. There is no reason why he should allow himself as Prime Minister to be made an instrument to perpetrate on parliament a ruling which if achieved could be extended beyond the present limitations. If the present interpretation as advanced by the Prime Minister is correct, then all that would have to be done would be to bring in the bill and have the minister introducing it simply say, "Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 and the title; I move that no further consideration be given to these clauses." How ridiculous can we become. How spurious an argument can be advanced. I quote further from page 1498 the words of Mr. Lapointe:

The duties of an opposition are, as he says, to discuss the measures which are submitted to parliament on the various stages of the bills, certainly not to obstruct. He says that would be a crime against the state. But, Mr. Speaker, when the measure is one that has the effect of making

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

parliament extinguish itself, when it is a measure for the purpose of taking away all the rights, privileges and powers of parliament, it is then the duty of the opposition to try to prevent its adoption and those who perpetrate a crime against the state are those responsible for bringing down such a measure . . .

I read that because I did not want to leave any portion out.

What he would conceive as a parliament is that we should stand at attention and salute when the Prime Minister wants us to do so, a parliament that would be ready to goose-step at the behest of the Prime Minister. Sir, the methods of the czar have produced bolshevism, and we do not wish to introduce that in Canada. It is an evil work, I claim, on the part of those who are in this way undermining the authority of parliament . . .

Those were the words of that tribune of democracy who, regardless of whether one agrees with him or not, at all times knew his sincerity, his capacity and his statesmanship. I ask the Prime Minister even now, even on the basis of a simple mathematical formula, if he were arguing a case in the Supreme Court of Canada, and there were three judgments along one line and one along the other, would he argue that the one should be preferred to the three, particularly when the acceptance of his interpretation of No. 1 would have the effect of emasculating parliament? Surely this government will not pursue its stubborn course. I join with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in saying, what I have said in this parliament and outside, that I never believed that this thing would take place, with a man like the present Prime Minister in this position. I have always said, "After all, while one may disagree with him, he will endeavour at all times to uphold the sacredness of parliament". I ask him even now to make, or at least endeavour to make, and restore it as a temple of freedom instead of a place of majority repression.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, I have one further ground to bring forward and on which to base new argument, as you yourself invited, and that is the ground of commonsense. What are we being asked to do if we establish the precedent on the basis of the motion made by the Prime Minister today? We would be asked to emasculate the committee and to prevent the committee from doing that job for which it was set up, namely, to help the House of Commons, which has referred this bill to us.

I refer you to a citation in an old book but an authoritative one, Palgrave's "Chairman's Handbook", where you will find at page 87 the following passage under the heading "Duties and Powers of a Committee":

The assistance of those who appoint the committee is its legitimate function.