on the Carter report. Everybody knows that the cabinet is split down the middle on the Carter report.

The other day the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Gordon) brought down the Watkins report on foreign control of the Canadian economy. The speech from the throne said that the government would bring in a white paper about what the government proposes to do about foreign control of our economy. Did the President of the Privy Council bring down that white paper? No. On the contrary, he had to announce that the government accepted no responsibility for the recommendations of the Watkins commission.

For five years this government has been promising us that we would have a Canada development corporation. At the beginning of this session, on May 8 last, the speech from the throne indicated that a Canada development corporation was to be set up. But has it been? The legislation is not even on the order paper. And why is that, Mr. Speaker? This government is divided about whether we should have a Canada development corporation and what kind of corporation it should be.

This government is like a blind Samson with its hands tied. It cannot agree on what it should do. One part of the government wants to go one way and one part of the government wants to go the other, and in this process of indecision they have brought the country to its present state. How, therefore, can the government now ask us to vote confidence in it, to vote confidence in fiscal, monetary and economic policies that have brought this country to its worst state in several years? The government's stock has not been lower since it took office nearly five years ago. Unemployment is higher, interest rates are higher, the cost of living is higher, and the dollar is much more vulnerable and much weaker.

In this state of affairs I say to the government: You have no right in all conscience to ask us to vote confidence in you and to ask us to repudiate our vote of last Monday night. Our vote last Monday night indicated that we would not and will not support any taxation measure which will further aggravate the present inequities in our taxation structure. One can only say to the government these words, and I paraphrase what Cromwell said 300 years ago to the Long Parliament: "You have sat here too long for any good that you have done. For God's sake, go."
[Translation]
Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, must we adjourn at one o'clock? If so, I move the adjournment.

## [English]

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock L do now leave the chair.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.
Mr. MacEachen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might suggest to the house that we dispense with private members' hour today and also agree to sit from 8 to 10 p.m. with the normal dinner adjournment.

Mr. Siarr: That is agreeable to us.
Some hon. Members: No.
Mr. Speaker: Obviously the minister needs unanimous consent and there is no such consent.

Mr. Starr: We agree to the proposal made by the leader of the house.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate that the hon. member has agreed on behalf of his party but I definitely heard "nays". However, I will ask the question again. Is there unanimous agreement?

Mr. Douglas: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, you put both propositions together and maybe some of those who said "nay" did not mean they were opposed to both propositions. If Your Honour were to put them separately it would be possible to clear up this point.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate that. At the moment, however, one proposition has been put to the house and there is no unanimous agreement. However, the minister could well put a separate proposition forward.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): How often is the house leader going to be told how to do things?

Mr. MacEachen: Every time it is necessary. I am glad to learn. Possibly we could agree to waive the private members' hour and continue this debate during that period.

