

*Procedure and Organization*

75A and 75B, but that under no consideration could we accept order 75c, which says among other things, and I quote:

A Minister of the Crown . . . may propose a motion for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at that stage;—

Mr. Speaker, when we read that, we can realize that it amounts to closure, and since such a rule already exists, the government should have the courage to apply it when they are not satisfied with the course of events. As for us, we will fight all summer long if necessary this measure which, in our view, would be nothing more than a permanent and automatic rule of closure.

All hon. members know that we have collaborated with the government, as for instance in the case of a motion moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), to change the hours of sitting to expedite the business of the house.

Yesterday, I also pointed out that Bill C-202 had been passed quickly, even if it was not perfect.

It seems to me that proves our co-operation, and now the government alone is responsible for the fact that the house sits on and on, because it will insist on having a rule of closure adopted when one already exists.

Besides, we all wonder what the government wants to hide in the next three years of administration. Every time an attempt has been made to muzzle the opposition, it was done to camouflage something fishy.

Let us assume, for one moment, that this parliament is living situations similar to those of 1963 and 1964, namely the furniture deal, that of the hon. Yvon Dupuis, whose friends deserted him, the escape of the prisoner who was to water a skating rink in the middle of May. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that similar situations should occur. We would then see the majority government apply Standing Order 75c, in order to prevent the Canadian people from finding out the truth.

We are also wondering whether the government intends to do away with the family allowances as it indicated some time ago. Does it intend to restrict credit or to let the interest rates increase? What new tax does it intend to levy? Finally, does the government intend to muzzle the provinces in deciding what it wants? We wonder about all these things and that is why we ask that Standing Order 75c be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, when I was young, my father who had an orchard, used to forbid us to

place a rotten apple in a barrel. The role of the opposition, today, is to prevent the bad apples from spoiling the others. Our role wants that we should adopt the good laws and reject the others, that rot should not invade the whole barrel.

Last night, at the time of adjournment, at ten o'clock, I was quoting a statement by a very well known journalist, Mr. Claude Ryan, who wrote in *Le Devoir* on October 30 an article on "The true face of the new federalism".

In my opinion, such an attitude must be exposed because the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is doing the Prime Minister's bidding. In the past, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) fought articles such as this, but today, the President of the Privy Council, because of the orders he gets from the Prime Minister, is compelled to act.

I subscribe to this statement by Mr. Claude Ryan and I quote:

Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau had the extraordinary luck to be elected leader of his party, then brought back to power without having to reveal to the Canadian public the real nature of his political ideas.

He was able for months to say the most outrageous things in the euphoria created by the advent of the Messiah.

No criticism could seriously reach public opinion. Even beforehand, confidence was placed in the hands of the wonder child of Canadian politics: every reasonable discussion was, as it were, interrupted during the time of the epiphany of Mr. Trudeau.

Four months after the election of June 25, things began to get back to normal. Fancy must give way to fact. Now, what we have been given to see for some time bodes no good—

When such a statement is made, we come to the conclusion, because of the orders that are given to the President of the Privy Council, in co-operation with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), that the Prime Minister gives orders and that all the government members obey them.

Besides I have in hand another statement published in the June last issue of *L'Action nationale*, where one can read:

In resolving to oppose constantly that opinion, to deny it the right to be heard at the negotiating table, on the false pretence of having to ignore its existence in favour of a Canadian prejudice, Mr. Trudeau obviously tramples a whole sector of the French Canadian nation perhaps even the whole of it, gives insult to the dignity of those who believe in it and directly and immediately incites the extremes of such an opinion to violence which in any event rumbles in the heart of those who have not been spoiled by partisanship.

Besides it is in that manner that statesmen become oppressors, by justifying themselves of the violence