

The Address—Mr. Olson

so that the beet producers can in fact get their total income from the sale price of sugar.

I have one or two other points to mention before I conclude, Mr. Speaker. I want to urge the government to repeat the kind of deal they made with Russia for wheat during 1963, particularly that part of it which called for 29,500,000 bushels in flour content. I say this because I know that all the flour mills in Canada are running at near or full capacity today, and they have firm prospects that they will continue to do so at least until the end of July. This is extremely important to the constituency of Medicine Hat, and to other parts of Canada also, because it in fact gives a stimulus to an industry that was very badly depressed before this order came along. I would hope that in future contracts the government, the Canadian wheat board and the Minister of Trade and Commerce will consider trying to negotiate to have a large part of the wheat order delivered in the form of flour. In the last order it was something like 12 per cent which is acceptable, because if the flour mills in Canada could deliver 12 per cent of all our exports of wheat in the form of flour we would not have any unused capacity.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this on my own behalf. I am not speaking for the party. This is with respect to what we are going to do with these phony motions of no confidence. I have given an undertaking to my constituents that I have no intention of either moving or supporting any what might be termed phony motions of no confidence. Whether they talk about the sales tax, about medicare, about family allowances, whether we believe in kindness to little children, or motherhood, they have exactly the same effect. If you support them you do one thing and one thing only, and that is dissolve parliament. That is all you do; because we know that even if we supported the amendment that is before the house today we would not have the sales tax rescinded. That and everything else that is on the order paper would die and we would go to the country. Therefore all we would have achieved would be to dissolve parliament. When I feel that is a desirable thing to do, and somebody moves a motion that we have no confidence in the government and there are not all these other double barrelled implications attached to it, I intend to vote for it. But in the meantime I think we all have to agree that the people of Canada voted in this parliament exactly as it is made up today. I am willing to accept that the people of Canada have the right to select a parliament made up in any way they like,

[Mr. Olson.]

and it is not our prerogative to destroy parliaments simply because we are not satisfied with the results of the last election.

I have talked to people in various parts of Canada, and by and large they are not particularly happy with this idea of destroying the institution that they set up because we may not like the way the house is made up. I think one of the improvements in the procedures of parliament would be to incorporate something in the rules so that we could do away with this sham that allows, for example, the press, after Tuesday night, to report that the government was sustained and all those people who voted against the amendment were in favour of the sales tax. Of course that is not true. Nevertheless that is the kind of sham we are faced with, with all these phony votes of no confidence. In closing I would like to express the hope that this parliament will do the job, and that all the members of this parliament will do the job they were elected to do; that is to help govern the country and to formulate policy in the interests of the country rather than in the interest of any one party.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Durham): Mr. Speaker, in beginning my remarks in this throne speech debate I would like, as has been the custom, to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I would also like to congratulate the newly elected members of this house, the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Leblanc) and the hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Prud'homme). I have had the privilege in the past week of meeting these gentlemen, and I believe they will make a contribution to parliament in the nature of the contribution that was made by their predecessors in office.

These newly elected members have made a contribution already to which I wish to draw the attention of the house for a moment. I think this has been referred to before. I refer to the issue that was raised in the by-elections in Laurier and St. Denis. The issue appeared to be between these hon. members who are now our colleagues in this house and the representatives of the party led by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). I think if there is any lesson to be drawn from the results of those by-elections, it is that the hon. member for Villeneuve and those in his party do not in fact, as they would like us in English Canada to believe, speak for our French speaking compatriots in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Honey: I should like to come back for a moment to my remarks congratulating the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I think these