

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

do so in two simple statements. What we have heard this afternoon is a doctrine that has no place in a parliamentary system embodying belief in the responsibility of the executive to the elected representatives of the people.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Hamilton:** The doctrine we have heard today is nothing less than asking the house to adopt the congressional system followed in Washington.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the minister has enunciated a philosophy that would have done justice to Cromwell the dictator when the minister said, "We are the masters". I hope that all Liberal members who were sitting in the house this afternoon and watching this demonstration will have been given sufficient indication how to pick their new leader. If they pick the new Minister of Justice as their leader they will pick a real patrician. He knows who the peasants are.

The Minister of Justice has challenged us on three issues. He raised the question of the position of a minority government. He raised the question of the system of responsible government. He raised the question of what is and what is not a vital issue.

I intend to commence my remarks by stating flatly that there is not one single authority in the written word that holds that when a government is defeated on a money bill it has the right to take a vote of confidence. I am familiar with the precedents of 1867-73 established in Canada. Only one of those precedents related in any way to money and it was an item dealing with a customs bill. I am also aware of the precedents in the British house from 1846 to 1886, and never once in all the times that a British government was defeated on a money bill did it fail to go to the Queen. The budget debates of 1852 and 1855 make that clear beyond doubt.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to my own thoughts on the subject we are now debating. This government stands condemned before the people of Canada of betraying precedents that have been built up over 700 years and relate to the people and those who govern them. There is no stronger foundation in that structure than the principle that declares that the people have the right to control the money that is taken from them. This principle goes back to Magna Carta. It has been laid down in our parliamentary structure and has evolved over the centuries to the present day in the Canadian House of Commons. It is

this doctrine that has restrained the pressure applied by those who want to seize power.

This does not mean that efforts have not been made during our constitutional history to take over control of the purse. In Canada we use the word "royalty" when we assess mining, oil or gas taxes, and it emanates from the period when the crown took away from parliament the right to control both incoming and outgoing revenue. Those kings, Mr. Speaker, paid a heavy price for tramping on the rights of the people. Likewise, in the days of Oliver Cromwell there was a period of dictatorship as opposed to parliamentary rule. We must never forget these things.

● (5:20 p.m.)

I well recall how in the early days of the war, in military camps all over the world, young men were asking, "Why are we fighting?" The government of Canada put out a book listing four reasons why we should fight to the death to make sure that Hitler's armies did not control the world. Read that book. It said that young men should fight because we have a system of government whose members are responsible to the people. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) stood in his place today and tried to shock this house and this country into a realization of what has happened here since last Monday. We have seen here a travesty of the rights of free men, a most shocking thing to happen under a government that calls itself Liberal. Never again will the word "Liberal" mean to Canadians what it has meant and never again will it be uttered with honour.

This matter resolves itself into two or three simple questions. As I said in opening, there is not a single written authority to say that where an important money bill has been defeated the Prime Minister has not gone to the country, to the Governor General or to the crown, as the case may be. There are hundreds of precedents to show that when a minor bill has been defeated a minority government has not always gone to the country. It is on those limited exceptions that the government rests its case.

Let us look at the precedents. One finds that, for the sake of stability, a minority government which is defeated on a minor bill does not always consider that defeat a matter of confidence because, as the Minister of Justice said, such governments would be going to the country every time there was a defeat. But, Mr. Speaker, the right to follow such a