

because the vote on the bill was a vote of confidence, since the bill deals with the whole economic program of the government. The article to which I refer appeared in an independent magazine which is recognized throughout the commonwealth and the United States as an authority on economics. This is what appears at page viii of *The Economist* for September/October 1967 and we agree with what is said here with reference to the policies of the Liberal government. It reads as follows:

Mr. Sharp, alas, cannot avoid the responsibility for inadequate fiscal action, the need for which he now seems belatedly to have realized. His budget did not revive last year's expansion, but it did nothing to stem the rise in costs and prices. Worst of all, it pushed interest rates higher, because the public was unwilling to absorb bonds, and generated a further increase in the money supply. There have been few examples of such a violent swing of the levers of economic control. Policies that would have been admirably suited to cope with a state of excessive under-utilisation of resources were continued well after demand was clearly pressing too hard on the limits of supply. This was not the fault of business, which was trying to cope with its own cost squeeze, but the fault of government,—

Why do they not come to grips with the question when every national newspaper in Canada has said to the government in the last few months that it has overspent, and that it

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

has run the country into blue ruin. The article continues:

—but the fault of government, which ought to have been far more sensitive to the signals that the economy was making to it. When the governor of the bank was warning Canada against the impossibility of getting a quart, Ottawa seemed to be going for half a gallon.

This is a half gallon government. When they only had a quart of milk they asked for a gallon.

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is a half pint government.

**Mr. Woolliams:** As my friend says, it is a half pint government. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It being six o'clock this house stands adjourned.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Before adjourning, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) made some remark about a half wit. I would say to him that the reception he received from 2,000 ranchers in Calgary proves they know who the half-witted Minister of Agriculture is.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It being six o'clock the house stands adjourned until 2.30 p.m. Monday afternoon.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.