

**Mr. Hees:** We want to decide.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):** The government is on the road to dictatorship.

**Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Will the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Howard:** You have embarrassed him enough already.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[Translation]

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, when people yell like animals, one cannot hear very well the questions asked. If somebody wants to ask me questions, I will answer them, but to bawl like a herd will not do very much for the decision.

The questions are not quite pertinent, if you want—

[English]

**Some hon. Members:** Just try it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[Translation]

**Mr. Trudeau:** I would like to carry on my little speech, and then if we have time, I shall be very pleased to answer questions.

I shall try to bring my demonstration to an end. When we refuse the house authority to settle basic differences of opinion which have arisen between the two main parties, we are denying parliamentarism, because this is the basic principle of parliamentarism, Mr. Speaker.

I am not saying that we are right, neither am I saying that you are wrong. I am simply saying that a difference of opinion has arisen between us, but that we cannot go to the people of Canada each and every time this happens.

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I believe I am now sufficiently acquainted with the mentality of the house to know that, should we have said last Monday that this party had lost the confidence of the house and therefore asked for a general election, we would have heard strong protests from the opposition benches. They would have said: So, this government is plunging the country into an election which the people do not want at this time, or: So, this government is calling

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

an election because it has been defeated on a mere technical matter. They would have demonstrated that the defeat of Monday night, last week, was purely on a technical matter.

I will not quote again at great length all the authorities. I will quote them nevertheless as a reminder, since the hon. members do not seem to recall them.

Beauchesne says that when—

[English]

The question for the third reading may be negatived, but as previously stated such a vote is not fatal to the bill.

[Translation]

This was citation 418.

Bourinot, in its third edition, page 648, has this to say:

[English]

If a resolution adverse to the bill be resolved in the affirmative; or the motion, "that the bill be now read a second time" be simply negatived on a division—

[Translation]

That is what happened: it is on third reading that the vote was negatived.

[English]

—the measure will disappear from the order book, but it may be revived at any subsequent time, as the house has only decided that it should not then be read a second time, and the order previously made for the second reading remains good.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** It was third reading.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Let me continue reading from Bourinot:

The same practice obtains with respect to the bill, in any previous or succeeding stage.

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** Now I should like to quote Erskine May, another great authority, page 571 of the seventeenth edition. The same thing is said whether you look at Bourinot, Beauchesne or Erskine May. It reads as follows:

If the question "That the bill be now read the third time" is negatived, such a vote is not necessarily fatal to the further progress of the bill. The more usual method of objection is therefore to move an amendment, putting off the third reading for three (six) months, or a "reasoned" amendment against the bill being now read the third time. The carrying of the former amendment is tantamount to the rejection of the bill, while, in the event of a "reasoned" amendment being accepted, it is unlikely that any further progress would be made with the bill.

I do not have the Canada Year Book here but, as I say, this is a technical matter. If we