

very skilfully and intelligently, and I did not mind agreeing with them that I could understand that they thought this place was falling into decadence because we spend days and weeks debating points rather than bringing debates to a conclusion by a vote, as the democratic system wants.

In this sense, Sir, I was pleading the excellence of the institution to them while conceding that it was not always well used. Perhaps I was biased in not saying that the government itself is perhaps also guilty of some misuse. The point I am making is borne out, I believe, by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), who met with them later and who said, in his words, that he was able to see the results of our exchange. I do not think he would believe that I convinced them in a very few minutes that Parliament was a place of nonsense. He must assume that they came here with a lot of these prejudices in mind, and that I did not take these prejudices out of their minds in the few minutes I met with them surely cannot be ascribed to me. I think his own testimony, on which he seems to be accusing me, was on the contrary—

An hon. Member: He is breaking the rules now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the right hon. Prime Minister for interrupting, but it seems to me that the right hon. gentleman should be allowed to make a statement as other hon. members were allowed to do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That is about what I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. I certainly can understand why the opposition was misled because apparently they read reports of the exchange but of course they missed the beginning of the exchange and they missed the context in which it took place.

I might say that I read the report in *Le Devoir* by a French reporter who was there. There was a slight bit more of the context, but I am quite sure he missed the beginning too.

This being said, I am a little bit surprised that all the opposition parties went to the extent of giving you notice, Sir, that I had treated this place with contempt and derision, without even having looked at the complete circumstances in which the exchange happened. If I were that touchy there might be a question of privilege I might raise. Indeed, there might be one in respect of something I understand the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said about me, that I never open my mouth here except to mouth obscenities, or something to that effect. My comment, Sir, is that this may be a point of debate, but I do not want to raise a question of privilege on this kind of matter and I am really surprised that the opposition is wasting the time of the House doing so.

● (11:40 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think hon. members would want to pursue the matter further. The hon.

Handling of House Business

members who raised this question by way of privilege indicated that they did not wish to propose or submit a motion for further consideration by the House. The hon. members who spoke in the course of this brief debate know the rules as well as I do and realize that in the absence of grounds for putting a motion there is no ruling required by the Chair. I would suggest only that perhaps the speeches made by the hon. members of the opposition and the reply made by the Prime Minister might help somewhat to clarify the situation and clear the air.

I should like to suggest one thought. To my way of thinking, Parliament is the kind of institution that can function only with good will between individuals and between parliamentary groups. It seems to me there has been good will among individuals in this House and between House Leaders; that has been pointed out by one or two of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. To the extent that there has been co-operation, understanding and good will among the parliamentary representatives of the House, we have made progress during this and previous sessions. I should think that if an effort were made by all of us there will be an even greater measure of good will and even greater progress for the benefit of the institution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in order to receive from you, Sir, a clarification of the rules of the House. Is it permissible for members in the future to refer to other hon. members as "he" and so on as the Prime Minister has just done?

Mr. Trudeau: Let us have a ruling on that.

[Translation]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Third report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs—Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski).

[Editor's Note: For text of above report see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

TABLING OF DOCUMENT ON BILINGUALISM IN CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I should like to lay on the table of the House in both official languages a document with regard to the plan to increase bilingualism in the Canadian Armed Forces.