

Procedure and Organization

democratic country and have not yet accepted a dictatorship. The Canadian people do not approve of this rule which was written by a few members of the government party who appear to be determined to ram it down the throats of the people and of the opposition.

The people of Canada still want democratic principles to be respected, and you of the government party have been elected under the label of democracy and not under that of dictatorship because at the present time, dictatorship has no place in Canada.

I should tell the government that we are sorry to see the character of this debate. If the debates of this house were protracted and there was a filibuster, as my hon. friend said a while ago, the fault lies not with the opposition but with the government. The reason was rule 75c that the Liberal party wanted to force on the population in spite of objections from a large majority. That is not democracy but dictatorship, actually. That is contrary to democracy, a type of government that we cherish and want to preserve.

If the Liberal members were sitting in the opposition, I feel that this house would be in a turmoil. I believe that none of them would have the courage to accept such a rule, a rule devised by some of them who turn up their noses at democracy. Today, they are all prepared to give in, to follow like sheep and to vote in favour of such a rule, and that against the will of the Canadian population.

Mr. Speaker, we heard all kinds of comments during this debate and, in my opinion, hon. members have brought out all that is important. They have tried to explain conditions, to give their views and they have asked the government to give in. They said that we from the opposition had up to now made several attempts in order to improve the rules and to speed up the business of the house.

The opposition has tried to attain a certain goal, but from now on the party in office must make concessions. It must catch up with

the opposition so that an agreement may be reached and so that the sovereign rights of democracy may be fully respected. It is the duty of the government at the present time to take the lead and meet the opposition, in order to reach an agreement.

I agree with the previous speaker who asked the government whether it would not be possible for both parties to agree and postpone the debate in order to bring the session to an end, in accordance with general consensus. It is certainly not to the credit of Canada that the house is sitting under conditions such as those existing at the present time, without any agreement or settlement in sight. Therefore, parliament should adjourn and proceed with the debate later on.

Until then we might all have time to find other solutions and other steps liable to give to the Canadian nation a real goal, that is, the existence of a sound and lively democracy, of a democracy which will give Canadians security and some freedom, and not only yokes, as it is presently intended.

Until now, Mr. Speaker, high finance has been favoured, it has received everything. Interest rates have increased, as well as those of bonds. For instance, as of July 1, 1969, bonds for which the rate was 5 per cent were renewed at 8 per cent. Those who used to get \$50,000 in interests on a million dollars worth of bonds will now receive \$80,000.

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Latulippe: That is what was done, Mr. Speaker. Nothing has been done for the people. Finance got everything—Let us think about the people, and—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. It being six o'clock, the house stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

[*English*]

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.
