

met our views by accepting one of our dearest principles, that is the possibility of voting against an important government bill without necessarily having to hold an election.

And all this will necessarily lead to a parliamentary reform establishing a fixed period for a government, to remain in power as in the case of municipalities and school boards or, for those who see big, let us say as in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as can be noted by restricting the time of a parliament to a specific number of years, it would be impossible, as alleged by certain Conservative speakers, for a government to maintain itself in power for years and years.

It is again one of their tricks to try and make the people believe that it is impossible to set a limit. By that method, each member would be absolutely free to vote as he pleases. We Créditistes have the deep conviction that we are here not to vote for or against a man, for or against a minister, for or against a government, but for or against a legislation depending on whether or not it is to the advantage or disadvantage of the people that we represent.

That is our only reason for being here. Then, the various parties simply become co-operators for those who accept, and instruments for those who are reticent. Therefore, it will be seen that we are way above the level of the old partisan politics whose myth still remains among many.

By so doing, those who will take off their blinkers to read the resolution will find that each and every word is important. This is the text of the resolution and I quote:

That this house does not regard its vote of February 19 in connection with the third reading of Bill C-193, which had carried in all previous stages, as a vote of non-confidence in the government.

In short, the resolution, in its present form asks the house not to regard its vote on February 19 as a non-confidence vote in the government.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The word confidence does not even appear in that motion.

That makes one wonder why Her Majesty's opposition keeps talking about confidence and non-confidence. The resolution introduced in the house is not even a motion of confidence. It states simply that parliament does not consider that the vote of February 19 was a vote of non-confidence.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the house quite frankly that when I voted last

#### *Motion Respecting House Vote*

Monday night, I was thinking of only one thing: defeat the bill increasing personal income tax by 5 per cent, nothing more. That is all I wanted. I voted to defeat the bill and I am happy about that.

That bill was very important and we wanted to reject it, so much so that even if the minister had risen at that precise moment—I do not remember what member of the opposition made that assumption a moment ago—and, in the hope of frightening us, had said: I regard this vote as a vote of confidence, well, Mr. Speaker, because of our principles and our convictions, we would have voted against that legislation all the same. I will even go further. If the government had not introduced the present resolution in its present form, that is if they had asked us to give them our confidence without withdrawing the bill which was rejected last Monday, we would have to vote against the government.

Furthermore, it is precisely in that vein that our leader, replied to the journalists who asked him how he would vote on a motion of confidence. At the time, the question involved was not a matter of confidence. He said: Against the government. That is precisely what I said previously, he was right, because at that time we could not foresee that the government would accept our requirements. But the journalists could not make head or tail of it, as they did not even suspect that there must be some diplomatic play between the parties. Some of them did so through ignorance, which reminds me of an anecdote.

Two lads were sent to the line of fire without having been given even elementary instructions. All they had in mind was to kill the enemy. All they heard was the voice of their general shouting: Fire, kill!

To their astonishment, after the cease-fire, they saw that same general cross the lines to parley with the enemy authorities. They thought, out of ignorance, that he was crazy, that he was contradicting himself, that he was ridiculous, a turncoat and had made an about-face. Is this not an exact description of certain newspapermen?

Others are prompted by personal or partisan interest. They are well aware of the misrepresentations they spread among the general public, and this is much more serious.

I saw in the papers large head-lines reading: "Caouette supports the government; Caouette saves the government." If those people had been sincere, do you not think they would have written instead: Caouette saves