

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, and as the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) said, whether or not the Grits or the Tories, the Liberals or Conservatives are in power, it is pretty well the same thing. I have seen them in office. I have seen the Conservatives in office, and the Liberals in the opposition. Now, the Liberals are saying exactly the same thing the Conservatives said when they were on this side of the house. And the Conservatives on that side of the house are saying and doing exactly what the Liberals were doing when they were on that side. As far as I am concerned, it is the same thing. Put them all in the same bag and then pull out, two of them, you can not tell which is which. It is the same thing for me.

Then, whether we renew or refuse confidence to the Liberal party, depending on what the Conservative party will do, will we be any better, Mr. Speaker?

● (5:30 p.m.)

I am proud of that choice, very impartially. I do not intend to destroy parliament or the economy of the country. No. I shall try to reason out my problem; in the first place, there is no difference between the two old line parties. However, I say to myself: still, there is a slight difference. When a political party, as is the case with the Liberal party at present, is cornered, with its hands up in the air, and its pants down, it feels badly, and it is willing to say: No, I shall never do it again.

**An hon. Member:** So, let it pull up its pants.

**Mr. Grégoire:** That's just it, it pulls up its pants and says: I shall not do it again. That is the difference.

But if the Conservative party were to come back to power—suppose there was an election and it should be returned to power with a good majority—it would say: This is the legacy we took over from the Liberals. It would be in no hurry to get a move on, because its position would be secure.

But the Liberals are now cornered whether we like it or not.

There are 129 Liberal members plus one, namely the member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) who said he would vote for the Liberals, which gives 130 members. On the other side of the house, there are 130 other members. This gives us even numbers. In addition, there is my vote; the Speaker votes only in the case of a tie.

Now, this is the way I reason it out. I say to myself, one party is no better than the other. Under the present circumstances, the Liberal party is cornered and as it has to struggle a bit more, we may stand a chance of getting it to shake a leg a bit more than the others. The Liberal party knows it is in a difficult position. We do not need elections, and it knows it. It will be defeated and, now, it must be ready to accept a compromise. If not, nothing will work. If it agrees to make concessions, then I am willing to co-operate. Why? Because I tell myself that under the present circumstances, they will try a bit harder than before. They are cornered, they do not want to move. There is no need for elections, they are crying "Uncle", no more no less. So now all is well, they are saying "Uncle".

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact, there are 130 of them. They are saying, "Uncle". I am willing to help. That, in truth, is the present situation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have a very clear amendment to move, which does not hold any grudge against anyone, which will harm no one, but which, if passed, will at least force the Liberals to act.

My amendment reads as follows:

I move—

I have found someone to second my amendment, Mr. Speaker. I asked my friend the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan) to second my motion. Further after he has seen my amendment I am convinced that the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) will also support me, to allow a debate on the amendment since I am alone against 130.

With his British fair play, my friend from York-Humber agreed; all I asked him to do was to support me. He is free to vote against the amendment, Mr. Speaker. All he is doing is to enable me to move my amendment and to discuss it. I am convinced that some other members of this house would have done likewise if I had explained the problem to them. Furthermore, the hon. member for Kootenay-West (Mr. Herridge) who is not here at present, would have also seconded my amendment. I am sure that the hon. member for Villeneuve would have done the same had he known.

So, I propose, seconded by the hon. member for York-Humber:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words following the word "that" and by substituting the following therefor: