

that it seems to me the amendment introduces confusion, and consequently lack of sense. Therefore it is hardly appropriate—

**Mr. Starr:** Don't say that about them; they are bedfellows with the Liberals.

**Mr. Knowles:**—in the motion.

● (8:50 p.m.)

A reference is made to "all previous stages". On second reading the bill carried with a recorded vote. When we use the phrase "on division" we mean, usually, that the vote is not to be recorded. Some clauses in committee were carried with a standing vote; some were carried on division. I think one can challenge the correctness of the words, and since including them would make nonsense of the motion, they should not be accepted.

**Mr. Nasserden:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The translation of the French version that we have makes reference to the word "approved" instead of to a phrase such as "carried in all previous stages". There is a difference. Either the French or the English version is wrong. In any event the motion seems to differ as between one language and the other.

**Mr. Pugh:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the house can cast reflection on any vote that has previously been taken.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do not think the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac intended to cast a reflection on the previous vote. His purpose is quite clear to me. He wanted the motion to read: "in all of its stages on division".

The point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is also clear to me, that the amendment, if carried, would make the motion difficult to understand. I might point out that it would also be contrary to the facts, since the bill was carried on first reading by unanimous agreement of the house, or without division.

In view of this, and since there is not sufficient clarity in the words of the motion proposed by the hon. member, I regret that I cannot accept the amendment.

[Translation]

**Mr. Latulippe:** May I give a few explanations?

**Mr. Grafftey:** It was not really serious.

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

**Mr. Latulippe:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether you have completely rejected the amendment—

**Mr. Speaker:** I remind the hon. member that I asked hon. members to give their opinion as to whether the amendment was in order or not. I ruled that it was not in order and I do not believe it is possible to proceed with the discussion.

[English]

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Acadia):** Mr. Speaker, I was interested in your ruling on the amendment and I was interested in the speech which was given to the house. If the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac (Mr. Latulippe) thinks the country is in such bad shape, why will he vote confidence in this government?

No doubt Canada today is passing through a severe financial crisis, which has been brought on by this government. What happened last Monday? Perhaps already that is dim in the minds of some. I was not here, being one of the 24 members of the transport committee that was in the maritimes. Some members were in the maritimes to help their constituents present briefs to the committee. All the same, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) complains that not enough members were in the house; that is why he feels that the vote on Monday night was not a vote of confidence.

By reading *Hansard*, anyone can ascertain what happened. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) called for the vote. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) was Acting Prime Minister. He was in the house, directing the affairs of the country to the best of his ability. One can see the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer) rising to his feet to urge all members to vote. That was the type of leadership we had on what will commonly be called blue Monday—blue Monday for the people of Canada, for democracy, and for the Liberal party. It is strange that a party which has adopted red as its colour should succumb on a blue Monday.

On a second reading the government won with a slim majority of nine votes. On Monday afternoon one clause of the bill carried with the slim majority of three votes. Surely the government had ample notice of opposition. Surely enough votes were taken to warn the government. It cannot now say that Monday night's vote is not to count as a vote of confidence.