

Motion Respecting House Vote

in our opinion, our reasons are much better than theirs, for they go beyond partisanship or tradition.

● (3:20 p.m.)

In fact, while they delight in an old myth from the stone age and persist in defending an obsolete piece of legislation, or still, what is undeniable, while they are deliberately playing politics at the expense of taxpayers, we are pushing on our fight to enforce our principles which will bring to the Canadian people salvation through the liberation of their representatives.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have well established principles on the judicial and social level. Ever since we came to this house, we have always urged the various governments to listen to us, and promised our support to the first willing to co-operate with us—regardless of party lines which matter little to us—because we are more than ever convinced today that partisanship has prevented our governments and the entire population from progressing towards more humane legislation.

I do not hesitate to say today, to the public at large, that if the Diefenbaker government had not isolated itself in its ivory tower in 1963 and refused everything to the Ralliement Cr ditiste in the definite hope of starving us to death, it would still be in power today. We had clearly defined our conditions to the government at the time, repeating that should they not be complied with, it would be defeated. We were asking very little: just the start of legislation. But from the top of his fortress, the great and inflexible dictator, the great leader refused; and so, the end came.

And again today they dare speak of dictatorship. Have the people fully understood the implications of this clash? I doubt it, for too many people still wear a political blindfold. Thank God, this is slowly disappearing!

Many will say: Yes, but your feathers are ruffled. We admit it was a difficult fight, even unequal, although we dared everything, since the two old parties brought to bear the full weight of their memberships, at the service of English and American high finance, using as an incendiary torch all the the most modern means of publicity such as newspapers, radio and television, etc., always at the service of capital holders, and spreading discouragement and discord.

We lost some gallant soldiers and strong fighters for the cause of the people. But they can be proud today, for their many sacrifices will not have been in vain. The old parties

[Mr. Gauthier.]

have forgotten that the armour of the Cr ditistes is in their hearts and that it does not come from the Royal Canadian Mint or from the pen of those who control our lives through money and credit.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the forthcoming vote—on which some members of the opposition have been heaping ridicule, which, incidentally, is a coward's last weapon—will be of capital importance for us and for all the members of the Ralliement Cr ditiste who are fighting for the right cause. It will set the seal upon our first great victory over traditional rules which all past and present parliamentarians have accepted and which they cannot accept any longer.

Mr. Graftey: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me—

Mr. Gauthier: We have been storming parliament hill for six years—

Mr. Graftey: Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a simple question?

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to finish my speech, I will then organize a forum, as I am accustomed to do in my parish meetings, throughout my riding.

We have been storming parliament hill for six years, hoping to win the free vote in the house, that is, the right—and this is very important—to defeat a piece of legislation without thereby defeating the government elected by the majority of the people and plunging the whole country into an election every year or every six months.

We are asking for something that is quite logical, and I think that the most concrete example we can find is at the level of our municipal and school institutions. Would a municipality, for example, be allowed to call a new election every time one of the resolutions of the mayor or the deputy mayor is defeated in council? Never, one would say. This is a utopian notion; why should we practise this illogical notion at the federal level?

The main arguments of the two old parties were "British tradition" and the unchangeable and apparently untouchable "rules of the house".

Well, Mr. Speaker, after that vote, we will be entering into a new era, since those two main arguments will no longer be accepted in this house, since finally due to the force of circumstances or a comprehensive democracy within our group, a government will have