

Non-Confidence in Deputy Speaker

meets people he invariably finds the discussion turns to this. There was a budget the other night but that is not discussed; the subject for discussion is what happened last Friday.

Mr. Grafftey: There is nothing to discuss about the budget.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): It is a proper measure of the budget.

Mr. Knowles: One of the members of one of the opposition parties—I need not name him—put it to me the other day very thoughtfully. He said: “What are we going to do to repair the damage we did to procedure on Friday night?” That made me think. I admit that we did some damage to procedure by the mistake which all of us made, so what can we do to repair that damage? We do not repair it by putting the blame on the Deputy Speaker. We do not repair it by putting all the blame on the government, though much of it they should take in view of the course followed. We do not repair the damage by putting the blame on one party or another. We will repair the damage by all of us admitting we made a mistake; by affirming, as did the Leader of the Opposition, that this is not a precedent and that it will not happen again.

Mr. Churchill: It was affirmed by him, but not by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin).

Mr. Knowles: I think the government should make the same affirmation. I think the government should agree that there was a better course which could have been followed on Friday night which would have given them the knowledge that parliament was with the government in this Cyprus operation, a course which would not have done damage to parliament. If we will take this stand and be honest enough to admit that mistakes were made, and make it clear that we will not make these mistakes again, then I think we shall repair the damage.

I regret that the hon. member for Lapointe has brought in this motion, which casts the shadow it does over the hon. member for Stormont, but perhaps in the end this is good. Perhaps it is better to have this matter aired on the floor of parliament rather than just talk about it in the corridors and in the coffee shops in the building. We have had it talked out; but having talked it out I hope that this motion will now be withdrawn and that we will have even more respect for our parliamentary institutions, because as men and women we are honest enough to face up to the situation and to do the right thing.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. Churchill: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Knowles: Certainly.

Mr. Churchill: I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he will press the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) to state, as did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), that this will not constitute a precedent. Because the Secretary of State for External Affairs did not so state.

Mr. Deschatelets: Why do you not ask him yourself?

Mr. Churchill: I will.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, as the only one so far who has admitted some personal responsibility for what happened last Friday night—although the only responsibility I have is that I kept quiet—I am prepared to urge the Secretary of State for External Affairs to admit that the government made a mistake. I am also prepared to urge the Leader of the Opposition to admit that he, like me, made a mistake by sitting quiet.

An hon. Member: He did.

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this party, and particularly for myself, I wish to take some of the responsibility for what happened on Friday night. I am responsible, because I was not here on that night. If you look at *Hansard* Mr. Speaker, I think an argument can be made with respect to the time lapse factor. Whether it was a few seconds or minutes, it becomes clear that there was some lapse of time between the time when the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) began speaking and when the first objection was raised. I know there have been other occasions when any time lapse at all has been considered sufficient to deprive a member of the opportunity to raise an objection to something requiring unanimous consent.

I do not propose to take a great deal of time to state our position with respect to what happened. I think every member who was in the house that night is prepared to admit that there was a mistake and that the responsibility for that mistake must be spread over most of the members who were here, and certainly those who were not here. In listening to all the arguments that have been made, however, three facts have become crystal clear. First of all, on Friday night the parliament of Canada was asked to consider an extremely serious and deteriorating situation. The second fact that is clear, from what has been said by those members who were in attendance that night, is that an overwhelming majority of the members present were in favour of taking the action they did take. The