

Procedure and Organization

If social, humane laws were introduced, if improvements were made to our economic system, if the rights of the individual, the human being, were recognized, it would be something new, and the opposition would then be happy to co-operate with the government.

Indeed, when the government introduces social laws, humane laws, with which the people agree, the opposition does not oppose them; it votes for their adoption.

We vote for any good legislation that happens to be introduced.

That is what we have been sent here for. We are not here to filibuster. We have been elected to administer, to represent the people, to take part in the making of legislation, in the best interests of the people. That is the reason why we have been elected.

Such is the position of the Ralliement créditiste and that has been our approach, so far.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the government is practically denying the rights and the principles of the opposition. It has decided to relinquish the safeguards of the laws and to curtail the prerogatives of the opposition.

We are against that and we are going to fight to the end so that the opposition may preserve its rights and prerogatives..

There would have been many subjects to discuss if the government had allowed, for example, a debate on agriculture. We barely had time to discuss agriculture. Canadian agriculture is in the worst state of stagnation it has ever known. We did not have enough time to discuss its plight because the government did not see fit to introduce legislation in that field and because it was afraid of being forced to do something for agriculture. It preferred doing something for finance, not for agriculture.

Many other measures concerning industry could have been introduced.

Indeed, the government could have proposed measures, Mr. Speaker—

● (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Papineau wishes to ask a question of the hon. member for Compton.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member if he agrees with me that if the Creditiste members had not engaged in a filibuster on the omnibus bill, the government would probably have had the opportunity to bring forward the legislation he is talking about.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

With all due respect, I wish to point out that the authority of the Chair is unmistakably put in question while the hon. member for Compton is making his speech.

I have noticed that since the beginning of his very interesting remarks, the clowns opposite have not had the decency to listen to them. They are busy talking among themselves and joking.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this is detrimental to the authority of the Chair and that we, from the opposition, are ready to co-operate with you so that your authority may be respected. If you need our help, we could tell off those clowns across the way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I am very grateful indeed to the hon. member and I shall follow his advice.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, as for the filibustering to which the hon. member for Papineau was referring, I had already answered by saying that we were filibustering because the legislation was unfair and that 80 per cent of the people were against it. That is why we have used this tactic.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to make laws and a laws is the result of several factors. Before passing a law, we must examine every aspect of it, we must put it through trial. A law should not only be conceived by lawyers, because even if they represent their profession well, if they are good at drafting laws, a law applies to every citizen. In order that a law be socially just, it must reflect the image of the nation as a whole.

Well, here, the whole nation is represented. The house has farmers, industrialists, businessmen, lawyers and doctors in short all classes of society are represented here.

Therefore, any bill that is passed must reflect the aspirations of Canadian society, and must not merely be a written text prepared by lawyers who handle words with great skill to make the laws incomprehensible.

The measure that the government is now proposing, that is rule 75c, does not reflect public opinion. Canadians are living in a