

Motion Respecting House Vote

houses and that they will never be able to own their own homes. I cannot imagine that this is Liberalism. Therefore, I have very grave doubt whether this government truly represents the Liberal party of which I am a member.

I am not saying that all these reforms could have been undertaken immediately, but over a period of five years we have had lots of time to tackle the problems. I know that all Liberals are anxious to bring about reform and in fact have a zeal for it, but it seems we have a government that will accept reform only at gunpoint. I think Liberals want reform in giant strides and not in the mincing steps that this government seems to take.

Let me put the whole matter of reform or lack of reform in miniature. Back in 1962 I pointed out the problem of our page boys. I am not going to delve into it at length now because all of us are aware of it, but it is a fact that we have 17 page boys, each of whom is a drop-out from school. They do not attend school. Our party says that education is the most important thing. Yet nothing or almost nothing has been done about this problem except for the Speaker's constant urging on it. In short, the government has not seen fit to tackle this problem and we are still faced with it.

● (4:40 p.m.)

There is a difference between zeal for reform and a keen plan for reform. Were I faced with the problem of voting confidence at the present time in this government on its record I doubt that I could. In the last few months I have been convinced that we have sincere and keen reformers in this party, some of whom are anxious to take over the leadership. We have seen some very good legislation brought forward. In all fairness hon. gentlemen opposite and on this side must admit that some of the measures introduced and to be introduced contain a spirit of reform which one might describe as embodying giant steps. Consequently I must move to the third proposition put forward by the Prime Minister. He suggested we should allow this government to continue until a new leader is elected and a new government appointed. I hope at that time we will have what I would consider a real Liberal government, and I am satisfied that we have good hopes in this regard.

There is one other matter relating to the administration that bothers me. I have in mind the whole question of two Canadas and

national unity. We all realize there is a great problem which must be solved and that involved in the answer is bilingualism. Bilingualism could be introduced very effectively and well, but I cannot forgive the government for passing on this problem to a royal commission not so much on the basis of language as on the basis of race. The initial words of the reference to the commission emphasized the two founding races. Any government should have known that this whole problem also involves Canadians who are of neither French nor English origin. These people have had enough of race problems and want no part of this one. The difficulty today is no longer one of bilingualism or biculturalism but rather one involving race. I hope the next leader of the Liberal government will face this issue and I hope that the Liberal party will have the courage to say it has had enough of racial division. There is no such thing as unity through division. We have a great challenge to meet today in the nation, and I hope the new Liberal government under the new leader will concentrate on this problem by forgetting about division.

None of the leaders or potential leaders of this party has satisfied me that he is attuned to this problem. For this reason I will reserve my decision and vote for the government on this motion. I believe there is an opportunity for true Liberalism and a true Liberal government, but I still have to be convinced that a future Liberal government will be a true Liberal government. My vote today is not a vote for the same type of administration.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, as other members of this party have mentioned, I trust this issue can be resolved today. I wish to rise in explanation of my position before the vote is taken. It is somewhat different from the position taken by my party colleagues. Our party practices democratic principles. Any member has the right to vote according to his conscience provided he explains that his vote is based purely on a personal opinion and does not represent party policy. This has been done by several members of this party on a number of occasions. I well remember that when the former government of Right Hon. John Diefenbaker was defeated there were two of us in this party who voted for the maintenance of that government on the evening it was defeated, in opposition to a caucus decision.

My remarks are not related to party policy or programs but rather to tactics. In my opinion the matter before us has nothing to do