

house and put the motion in the proper order; and when the vote was called it was properly conducted.

If there was trickery involved, sir, the Minister of Finance, I would point out, stated that he wanted to proceed with third reading.

**Mr. Sharp:** No; read the whole paragraph.

**Mr. Churchill:** All right. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will explain his position. Let me show the house that there was no trickery.

**Mr. Côté (Longueuil):** Read *Hansard*.

**Mr. Churchill:** I intend to read it. I refer to page 6895, the bottom of the first column. There we read:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Do I understand that the Minister of Finance does not want the bill to be read a third time now?

To which the Minister of Finance replied:

No, no.

Then an hon. member interjected:

At the next sitting of the house.

The minister's answer to both these comments was:

No, no.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the minister was saying he wanted to go ahead with it.

**Mr. Sharp:** I was objecting to third reading.

**Mr. Churchill:** Then as reported in the second column of the page, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said this:

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to third reading. I did not move the motion, and I am very sorry if Your Honour misunderstood. I was trying to catch your eye. If it is the wish of the house, I am perfectly happy to have third reading.

The Prime Minister tells the country that there was trickery in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker. He is accusing the Minister of Finance of using trickery.

Then, Mr. Speaker, to show the attitude of the government on that night let me recall this to your mind. When the yeas and nays were called Mr. Deputy Speaker correctly interpreted the will of the house and stated that the nays had it. And who then called for a recorded vote, Mr. Speaker? None other than the Minister of Transport, who jumped to his feet, flapped his arms wildly like this, and encouraged his reluctant members to stand up and have a recorded vote.

*Reference to Statement by Prime Minister*

I conclude, sir, by saying there was no deceit, no trickery, unless it was on the part of the government. Certainly there was no trickery on the part of individual members or any of the parties on this side of the house. I say, sir, this is a valid question of privilege for this house to decide.

**Mr. Nugent:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I must caution hon. members to limit their remarks as much as possible to the very limited question whether there was a prima facie breach of privilege in the words alleged to have been used.

**Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona):** I will confine my remarks to the question whether there is a prima facie case of privilege. I am sure we are all familiar with the rule that no member in an ordinary speech may reflect upon a decision taken by the house, whether in the ordinary course of proceedings or by a recorded vote. When on occasion we have had to refer back to decisions taken by the house, as the government do frequently in connection with the decision taken on medicare, in support of their contention that it must proceed, the excuse is given that it is the will of parliament. They say parliament has voted on the matter; therefore we must proceed because parliament has expressed itself. That is the only type of comment allowed on previous actions of this house. There is no need, Mr. Speaker, to look for specific authority for this. Nearly every day Mr. Speaker listens to hon. members who are dissatisfied with a decision of the house, whose remarks indicate they are not happy either with the decision itself or the manner in which it was taken, and the Chair is always quick to point out that this might be a reflection on a decision or action of the house and hon. members are quickly brought to order.

One of the things on which we pride ourselves as members of this house and as hon. gentlemen is the sincerity of our motives. There can be no suggestion that any member of this house acts otherwise than as his duty as a member of the house impels him to act in considering the matters before him. He acts as his duty to his country and his constituents dictates.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the Prime Minister, which certainly have not been explained away by the facetious manner in which he answered the hon. member for Kamloops this day, must be looked at in the