

Motion Respecting House Vote

• (2:50 p.m.)

If this is to be the funeral of the Canadian parliamentary system, I am so glad I belong to a party which refuses to be an honorary pallbearer at that funeral, or a rewarded pallbearer like the Cr ditistes at parliament's funeral. They have formed the Martin-Caouette axis; the Prime Minister admitted this much over the week end. Although the Secretary of State for External Affairs was silent on this, the Prime Minister smoked him out and told us the facts.

I am happy to have taken part in this debate to register my voice against the march of autocracy, tyranny and dictatorship, which are no longer lingering shadows over this parliament but firmly recognizable now in Canada as a part of our institution. What a dangerous precedent this government are trying to establish, Mr. Speaker.

Before I leave this constitutional question I just want to say a few words about what the Minister of Finance, who is absent from his seat, has said in the debate. He spoke with two voices, or used two different phrases that are both characteristic of the government. The minister said that Canada should not carry on without this \$400 million, that it was a major matter. At the same time he tried to go along with the suggestion of the government, and even though I know he is opposed to that suggestion he has not resigned. The minister talked about the danger of discussing the dollar and the economy, and the international implications of this.

In the early stages of my remarks I quoted from *The Economist* and put on record the view of that publication regarding the financial crisis brought on by the government, and its international repercussions. While the Prime Minister is worrying about the financial situation of the country and how his own actions might affect Canada internationally, I would remind him of what was said in an article in the *The Albertan* on May 22, 1962. This newspaper is a little worn now but I am glad I saved it. This is what this publication had to say in connection with the problems the Conservatives were having with the dollar:

Pearson fears big price rise result of devaluation. The Conservative government's "panic devaluation" of the Canadian dollar will force up the cost of living to record all-time highs and impose a heavy financial burden—

—and so on. Did the right hon. gentleman worry at that time when he was leader of the opposition? Did the present Minister of Finance or Minister of Transport worry? No,

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Speaker; they travelled across the country not caring whether they would run Canada into blue ruin either internationally or domestically. Their conduct is illustrated by this article to which I have just referred.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these same hon. gentlemen are coming in with those soft voices they have and telling us that we must discuss the economic situation. We must follow their program, even though we are facing a financial crisis, to stem any run on the dollar. They did not care about a run on the dollar in 1962. They were irresponsible then, Mr. Speaker, and as far as their constitutional duties are concerned they are being irresponsible now.

I believe the *Globe and Mail* expressed the majority editorial opinion in its editorial in the February 22, 1968 issue. The article declared that the government were breaking rules for power, that they were breaking rules to get a dictatorship, that they were breaking rules so we can now have a republican system instead of a parliamentary system. Another editorial in their February 21, 1968 issue is headed "Defeat is defeat". I suggest the government are not measuring up to their responsibility. They have been defeated but are trying through television and radio broadcasts to drag across the trail red herrings so as to turn us away from the main subject.

Their constitutional duty today, Mr. Speaker, is to resign. The Prime Minister should go to the Governor General and discuss in this situation who should form the government. That is the responsibility of the Prime Minister, one that he and the government refuse to take. The Liberals rule by divine right in every regard.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Cr ditiste party, who voted against the tax bill as well as against the Liberals' economic and financial program, having been, as we have, critical of both, will measure up to their responsibility as members of parliament and at the proper time, when the vote is called, vote with the opposition.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, as our leader said last Friday, we hoped the debate might end that day. On behalf of our party I now express the hope that the debate will end today. Accordingly we are prepared to limit our participation.

One point I think was noted by everyone last week. The debate on the issue before parliament was primarily carried on outside this chamber over radio and television. I think the Toronto conference on the Canadian constitution, the recent federal-provincial