

be more people writing as Charles Edison did in 1948:

Some people put themselves above politics saying, "Politics is dirty", or "I have no patience with politics." In the name of all that's American (Democratic) how can any good citizen feel superior to politics? We achieved our independence by politics. We freed the slaves by politics. We are taxed by politics. Our business flourishes or withers by politics.

If we have bad reputations as politicians, perhaps it is because we have indulged too much in the sport of childish quarrels. I want to repeat that the leader of the official opposition has acted in a way that will increase their prestige because he refused to let some of his members engage in a filibuster. I believe this was the right thing to do.

I want to say that I will vote for this motion. I do not do so because I believe this government is perfect. However, I do not think another government would be any closer to perfection, so what is the use of changing? As I said, I have consulted my people. I am convinced this is a time for action and not a time for an election. I repeat that we should, without delay, amend our procedure, and we should try to cut expenditures instead of increasing taxes. Then we can go into an election some time toward the end of this year. I hope that after that election all my present colleagues will return.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, may I put a question to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières?

Mr. Mongrain: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Valade: Is not the hon. member for Trois-Rivières fully aware of the fact that the Conservative party never asked for elections at this time of the year, but for the resignation of the government which proved itself unfit to manage the nation's business? We never spoke of elections. There are certainly other possibilities, and the hon. member for Trois-Rivières will agree on that.

Mr. Mongrain: I would like to tell my good friend and colleague for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) that his question is as insidious as certain interventions of his on television the other day and that he is misrepresenting the problem.

It may be that no one said it clearly in the riding of Sainte-Marie, but in certain quarters people have said: It is time for you to go.

Motion Respecting House Vote

For instance, one English politician was quoted as saying, "For goodness sake, go". What did that mean?

Mr. Speaker, we must not play on words. All those who can count to 130, 135, know full well that a 90- or 91-member party could not administer the country very long; I can hardly see a coalition government made up of the New Democrats and Ralliement des Créditistes. As for the Independents, I can see neither of the three in that government. It would not be long before that government would be defeated. I am convinced that my friend from Sainte-Marie is far more intelligent than he lets on.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that he is as intelligent as I thought him to be.

[English]

Mr. Terence Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to take part in this debate. I must say I am glad I did not have to speak on Friday afternoon. The leader of our party did such a tremendous job that I would have found it very difficult to follow him at that time. Perhaps I am exaggerating when I say it was one of the finest performances I have seen in the house because there was a very bad performance to contrast it with which perhaps made it look better than it really was. The whipping that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) gave the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) on Friday had to be seen and heard to be believed. I suppose it is only to be expected that one's job is a little easier when one has a good case. Certainly the Prime Minister had a very tough job trying to put forward what can only be described, even by his friends, as a very bad case presented with his usual mixture of arrogance and evasion.

On coming into the house this afternoon I heard a story connected with the old familiar cry of trickery or that the government was beaten by a fluke. It goes something like this, Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition was unfair in his battle tactics; the Prime Minister knew he was going to have a battle but he did not realize that the Leader of the Opposition was going to use that most suitable of parliamentary weapons, the sword of truth. This was considered unfair tactics because the Prime Minister is a complete stranger to that weapon and therefore felt that he was going into battle unarmed.

I understand the Prime Minister thinks it is only fair that the decision should be based on the best two out of three. Rather than trying