

*Non-Confidence in Deputy Speaker*

does rest on the government. I believe that the government chose the wrong course on Friday night. When the government knew that there was opposition on the part of some hon. members to a resolution being dealt with during a perfectly proper sitting, I think that what they should have done was to ask to revert to motions, and on motions, for the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) to have made a statement exactly in the terms of the statement he did make on Friday night. Then there should have been an opportunity for the leaders or spokesmen of each opposition party to make statements. If that had been done the government would have known the view of parliament on the issue of sending troops to the United Nations peace keeping operation in Cyprus. Had that been done the government would have carried out its commitment to consult parliament.

The motion itself was not really necessary. It had no legal effect in any event. It did not say that parliament approved; it merely said that it was expedient for the houses of parliament to do something. Everyone knows that parliament has three branches, the House of Commons, the Senate and the crown. Parliament has done something as a parliament only when a bill goes through both houses and receives the consent of the crown. All that was put through on Friday night was a pious resolution in this house, and a pious resolution was put through the other house, which gave the government the green light to do what it did. The executive has the authority to put troops on active service; the only legal requirement is that it call parliament within ten days after taking such action. The only reason the question was brought before parliament was because the Prime Minister made the commitment that he would bring the matter before parliament, and I honour him for doing that and also for having placed the matter before parliament on Friday night. But the mistake which the government made was in the way it chose to do this, and when opposition was expressed to a motion being made without 48 hours' notice or unanimous consent being given, it should have chosen the other course.

I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that had the government asked for leave to revert to motions and made a statement they would have had the views of the house. The views expressed would have been overwhelmingly of the opinion that the action proposed was what Canada wanted to do, and after such discussion it might even have been the case that there would have been unanimous consent to put through a motion affirming the views expressed by the house. As I say, Mr.

Speaker, I think this was a mistake in judgment with regard to the way to handle the matter.

Now, why did I not say this on Friday night? I like to believe that I can think quickly about procedural matters, but I confess I was taken by surprise when the government presented its motion. I thought we would just get a statement, to be followed by other statements. I was aware of the international implications of this and of the misunderstanding which could arise from a procedural argument at that point over our participation in the United Nations peace keeping force. I was also aware of another dilemma. According to a note I made of the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), he said that all over the free world concern would be felt if we got into a procedural argument and failed to act—or something like that. But it is also true that if we are to keep freedom we must maintain intact our parliamentary institutions and maintain intact the protection of the rights and privileges of the minorities in such an institution.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a mistake was made on Friday night. But who made the mistake?—not the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Lamoureux) acting as Deputy Speaker; not a few people upon whom the blame has been placed; and not just the government by the way it brought this motion forward. The mistake was made by all of us in not objecting to the course which was taken. That being the case it seems to me that we should not be asked even to vote on this motion. It will require unanimous consent to have it withdrawn, but I hope that the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gregoire) will ask for that consent and I hope that the house will give it. I urge this course of action because I do not think it is fair for this house to put on the Deputy Speaker the stigma of having two, three or 13 votes cast against him, for the fact is that he has done a good job as Deputy Speaker and as one of the presiding officers of the House of Commons.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I went through a fair amount of torment and unhappiness on Friday night because of the procedural angles in which the house got involved. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) has pointed out, I got into the argument about whether or not we were sitting in accordance with the rules; but I did not get into the other argument, for the reasons I have already given. I have thought about this a lot. Indeed I know of no procedural situation since the pipe line debates of 1956 which has occasioned so much discussion around this building. Every time one goes for coffee or tea or for a meal and