

*Non-Confidence in Deputy Speaker*

that I suggest a certain deviousness on the part of government members has injected itself into the debate on this motion. It seems, sitting over here, that the design has been to regard the parties on this side of the chamber as four separate groups, rather than recognizing an official opposition. When the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) comes along now and says that we must all share in what was done on Friday night—as have other members—it seems to me they are using their argument in one fashion when it suits them, and in quite another when they want co-operation in the house. Let me conclude—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Nielsen:**—sir, by making two further points, and they are these. That an error was committed on Friday night there can be no doubt; and that that error lies at the doorstep of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) there can also be no doubt. The other point is that—

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) who is not here, had heavy responsibilities at that moment as head of the government of this country, I am sure my hon. friend would want to indicate that the action taken by the Prime Minister was not only in the national interest but an attempt on the part of this country, and of all hon. members of this house, to make a contribution to peace in Cyprus and, indirectly, perhaps to peace in the world.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Nielsen:** There can be no doubt at all about that, sir. I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs will recall that the leader of the official opposition at all times co-operated on behalf of this party in saying that unanimous consent would be given to interrupting the ordinary business of the house at any time the Prime Minister felt it necessary to do so. There was that same co-operation when it came to the conclusion of the debate, when there was no dissenting voice from this party to the sending of troops to Cyprus. The co-operation was there.

The point I make is simply that the Prime Minister was wrong in his choice of method to bring the matter before the house. There were alternate procedures available; they were not taken advantage of. There was no consultation between parties on a matter as important as this. Because of these factors the Deputy Speaker was placed in this unenviable position of facing a motion of censure, a motion that I suggest was brought on

by the ill-conceived decisions as to procedure that were made by the Prime Minister and the government.

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to close the debate, but I would just like to ask a question of the hon. member. Since he has pointed out the man who he thinks is responsible for this situation, is it the hon. member's intention to bring a motion blaming the person responsible?

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that under our rules it is impossible at this time to raise a subamendment to a motion of this nature.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken part in the debate had I not been challenged. I took part in the debate last Friday evening, until the very end, and it was said that my speech had been a little harsh because I stated to the house that I knew very well that I was speaking for nothing. I meant what I said then because I had witnessed so many violations of the rules of the house.

Mr. Speaker, when you try to follow the rules and to learn them a little more each day and you see old politicians, who always jump up if we go against the rules, do so themselves blatantly, you cannot help but feel that it is enough to demoralize a young member. And sincerely, last Friday evening, I asked myself if the house could really sit today in view of all those violations of the rules.

We are now discussing the motion of the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gregoire) and everybody seems to be confessing his guilt. Everybody is beating his breast and feels a bit responsible, except the real culprits. That is what I find strange, Mr. Speaker.

I admire those who recognize that they have transgressed our regulations but, as I say, I blame those who refuse to acknowledge their responsibility and who bear in fact the largest part of the guilt.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

**Mr. Speaker:** It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motion and public bills.

[*Text*]

Order. It being five o'clock p.m., the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions, public bills.