

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For obvious reasons the motion is clearly out of order. It is as much out of order, as frivolous and as vexatious as the government motion appearing on the order paper and which is now before the house.

Mr. Speaker: I had invited the hon. member for Lapointe to indicate whether he had any arguments to make on the point of procedure.

[Translation]

The hon. member who is an expert on matters of procedure will recognize that this amendment goes far beyond the very limited scope of the motion now under consideration. It is a substantive motion or proposal which could be discussed only after notice or unanimous consent of the house. For those reasons, I deem the motion out of order.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, convinced that my amendment was in order, I had not finished my remarks. If you had read it in full instead of dispensing with it, I feel that—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I gave my ruling on that matter and I did not have to read the motion, because I heard it while the hon. member read it slowly and clearly. That was enough to enable me to reach the ruling I have just made.

Mr. Grégoire: Then, Mr. Speaker, as there remains a few minutes, may I continue my remarks?

I think that my program would restore confidence in the government. I am of the opinion that they should say something, state clearly what they advocate. But we have heard nothing at all on that subject. They should tell us exactly what they intend to do to justify the confidence of parliament. If they do not do so, I will not be ready to vote for them. If they have intentions, let them say so and we will then form an opinion. But if they say nothing, as did all Liberal members who spoke today—we see that they want to continue as in the past—I am not ready to support the government.

Moreover, if they want to tell us, to specify why they deserve the confidence of parliament, and what they intend to do, instead of telling us: If there are elections, there will be a dollar crisis—which is to frighten us, and I am no longer afraid of that—we will be able to reach a decision. Let them tell us exactly what they intend to do and why we should

Motion Respecting House Vote

renew them our confidence. So I ask them this question: Do they intend to restore the economy, to lower unemployment in the country? Do they intend to act, to do something? If they answer yes, I shall support them. However, if they are not ready to tell us why we should put our confidence in them, I am not ready to support them.

That is why, in the end, it is up to the government to tell us what they intend to do, and on that we shall judge whether we should support them, not on what they have done in the past, for that is none too brilliant, none too outstanding. Besides, if we must judge on past record it is not worthwhile changing governments.

If they intend to improve the situation, to take measures to lower unemployment and restore the economy, let them say so, and we shall judge them according to their intentions and not in any blind fashion.

[English]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, after listening to this somewhat lengthy debate, I would with your permission read the motion that is before the house once more so as to get the motion before hon. members in such form that the points I intend to make in reference to it will be clear on the record. As has been said by other speakers, this is a very unusual motion. It is a sort of left-handed method of bringing something before the house after the government has been fired. The motion reads as follows:

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

First of all, when you analyse and read the motion it seems to me that if the government felt it was on sound ground it would have brought in a simple motion of confidence or no confidence. What the government is trying to do—and if there are any tricks of the trade at all, they are on the other side of the chamber—is to revive a tax which has been voted down by the opposition, in total. That is what the government is trying to do. If they sneak this motion under the wire, they will try to bring back the tax in question.