

*Procedure and Organization*

they provoke in order to establish the police state, and crush the opposition instead of allowing it to dialogue.

● (3:20 p.m.)

It is obvious that, by refusing to face facts and to make a real try at consultation, Mr. Trudeau is progressing from the violence of a refusal to co-operate to the violence found in a police state.

We agree with him that we are now under the threat of tyranny. We beg of him to give thought to the responsibilities that will be his if he persists in closing his mind to the real problems through plain arrogance and ideological intransigence.

Everything will come to a standstill in Canada. In the face of such statements, the only possible conclusion, with regard to what we have before us, is that it is precisely because of his arrogance that the Prime Minister wishes through permanent and automatic rule of closure, as I was saying a short while ago, to impose or prevent possible debates that could take place so that the Canadian people could at least be aware of what is going on in the Canadian parliament.

In support of my contention, I have here some quotations and, in particular an article entitled *La liberté des débats et de la discussion publique*, written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Members on the government side who have known Sir Wilfrid Laurier are no doubt in a position to state that he wanted liberty to prevail in this parliament. I shall read an article that was published in 1913. It is customary in this parliament to refer to facts already belonging to the past. Therefore, it should be normal that I read in full what Mr. Borden, prime minister at the time, had to say on the matter and what was the reply of the Liberal members sitting in the opposition.

We realize that Tories or Grits always feel the same way. When one party is in office, the other one feels that the government is too arrogant, and if the latter is in power, the other party feels that a dictatorship is being established.

But let us rather read the reported facts and I quote:

On April 9, the right hon. R. L. Borden, M.P., brought before the House of Commons some amendments to the standing orders, the purpose of which was to limit the freedom of the proceedings and of the public discussion through a procedure generally known under the names of "closure" and "guillotine".

If this is not similar to standing order 75c, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what it is.

And Mr. Borden went on:

The excessive strictness of his amendments were already blameworthy, but the methods by which

[Mr. Dumont.]

it was attempted to force them on the opposition are far more arbitrary and hypocrit than anything bad that has ever been done in the parliament of Canada. The Prime Minister first protested his good faith and that of the government.

What the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said yesterday: If the opposition parties are reasonable, we shall never use rule 75c, was stated in 1913.

At that time, a Conservative prime minister told the Liberals: Be quiet, there are only two parties. There is no minority party, as has been said. We shall get along very well and when you leave, you will be appointed to other places, lucrative positions and there will be no problem. That happened in 1913.

Let us examine the statement made by Borden to strengthen his position. He declared, and I quote:

No one is more ready than I to acknowledge that freedom of speech and of debate must be preserved.

It is with those words that the prime minister began his speech on the amendments which he was moving for concurrence.

And to further eliminate any doubts he had raised, he added:

My hon. friends are very suspicious; I think they should be prepared to accept my word in the matter.

And Sir Wilfrid Laurier pointed out, on behalf of the opposition, that as a result of those amendments, a constant threat was hanging over them. Borden protested so candidly and with such frankness that one can hardly recognize the same man in the person who was talking that way and the one who, a few minutes later, was to become guilty of such a shameful treason.

He replied to Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the following words:

Not at all; that is not the way in which I would desire to exercise a power of this kind. I would think that if this rule passes, things might go on in future just as they have in the past.

That is the same statement as the one we heard yesterday. We are assured that everything will go well, that no problem will arise. Yet, as I said a while ago, except for the consideration of the omnibus bill, we have fully co-operated. During the debate on the omnibus bill, it was a matter of principle. We had the duty, as Christians, to oppose it, but except for that bill, many other pieces of legislation have been introduced.

We have agreed to longer working hours, as proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), and not satisfied