

Point of Order

almost lost its abortion debate because of that kind of trickery.

What happened on May 25? I wish my colleague, once and for all, would read how outraged the Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House was, as I am. He blasted the NDP for what they tried the night before. They cannot have it both ways.

Do hon. members want me to read it? I will quote, Mr. Speaker. I have been very succinct. I have worked night and day since Thursday night because I feel it is an insult to intelligence. It is not the way to conduct our affairs. We may disagree, esteemed colleagues, but let us do it in open. This is not the way to run parliamentary affairs.

The government is almost making me upset over having decided, with the greatest joy of my life, to run for this office on February 10, 1964. I still say my respect for this institution is growing every day. We do not want to bring what is going on in the Senate into this House. I know some senators will disagree, some friends and colleagues of mine. I do not wish to break all my friendships with everyone today, but this is not the way to conduct our affairs in this House.

Now, my young friend, the assistant leader, is having a lot of fun because he succeeded while someone was washing their hands on Friday and someone else was absent. Those who were interested were not here. He passed the motion that I disagreed with on Tuesday night.

I know some will say that the Liberals are fighting with each other during this debate. I am waiting for those would try to pick a quarrel with Liberals because that would not enhance the debate and that would not enhance the respect we should have for this House. How many times do I have to repeat that respect for this House, respect for the parliamentary process, and respect for our country?

[*Translation*]

That is right for our country, Canada, as I stated on Thursday evening. I said I was proud to be a French Canadian, which we are, and to be here for two main reasons. I insist, Mr. Speaker, that nobody was abusive toward me over the week end. Everyone who phoned me said: "It was a very interesting debate."

[*English*]

It was a very interesting debate. I have made my point. I do not want to go on, but I could, Mr. Speaker. I depend on you to give me guidance. I know that we can do anything by unanimous consent, but it is an abuse of the parliamentary process to proceed that way. It is an abuse by consent.

• (1520)

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise to address this point because I also share the sense of deep concern expressed very eloquently by the member for Saint-Denis. I think it is important that we recognize the history of this matter.

On Tuesday, October 16, there was a suggestion made by the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader, that a substitute motion to the motion that was then before the House dealing with the question of the crisis in the gulf should be put. At that time, the hon. member for Winnipeg—South Centre, speaking on behalf of the Official Opposition, and myself, speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party, agreed in good faith to that substitution. That agreement was predicated on one very important element.

As I stated in the House, as recorded at page 14250 of *Hansard*:

I just wanted to underline the point made by the member for Winnipeg South Centre, as well, that it is certainly our understanding that this new motion would indeed be open to amendment as its predecessor was.

It was on the basis of that understanding and that understanding alone, that on Tuesday, October 16, we did agree to allow for a substitute motion to be put.

Without going into the reasons for this, that substitute motion was not put at that time. We continued debate on Thursday well into the evening, until nearly 10 p.m., debating the motion in its original form together with the amendment of the Official Opposition and the sub-amendment proposed by the New Democratic Party. That was the focus of the debate. I was present for the entire course of that debate.

That was also the basis for the decision to allow the vote to be deferred by agreement to Tuesday at 6 p.m. What was being deferred very clearly was the original motion, the amendment, and the subamendment. All members left the House on Thursday evening assuming