

alarming rate. I do not say this necessarily in respect of the rights and privileges of hon. members as such. However, it is the members of parliament who represent the people of Canada, and it is the rights and individual freedoms and liberties of the people of Canada which day by day, week by week and year by year are being whittled away, cut down and destroyed by the massive monolithic structure of big government. I honestly believe that all members of the house feel this way. Surely it is a matter of the greatest concern that we should examine the position the government has taken in respect of the proceedings of Monday night.

Surely one of the few remaining rights we, as representatives of the people who sent us here, have, is to challenge the government when in the opinion of hon. members of this house, and in particular in the opinion of hon. members of the opposition, the government has embarked upon a course which we consider to be improper and incorrect. The issue in question on Monday is of such magnitude that it involves the very heart and core of the government's spending proposal in respect of the fiscal year and the mini-budget introduced by the Minister of Finance last November. Surely, when the government is defeated on that issue it has no other honourable course than to resign. This is a matter which involves the collection of taxes and seeking to dig deeper into the pockets of the taxpayers of this country.

It is said that during budgetary proposals it is the custom and practice for taxes to be imposed prior to the passage of the legislation. I accept that as being the practice of this parliament. But when a government does this it stakes its life on its ability to obtain from this house and this parliament the legislation which is necessary in order to legalize what heretofore it had been doing illegally. This is not a situation in which one finds it necessary to quote precedent. I suggest that here we have a set of circumstances which are unique and unknown in parliamentary history, for the simple reason that never before has a government which has been defeated on a financial measure of this kind failed to resign. This is the reason hon. members cannot find any precedent.

I am glad to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) in the house. When my leader a short time ago was making a very strong point with regard to the position of the government he said that any cabinet minister who had been sitting in the house

#### *Motion Respecting House Vote*

prior to the vote on Monday night must have accepted the fact that the vote was a vote of confidence. The only hon. gentleman I could see who shook his head at that was the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the Canada Year Book, 1967. The hon. gentleman has much to do with this publication. At page 86 I find these words:

When the cabinet (the government) suffers defeat on a government bill or a vote of censure or on a motion of want of confidence in the Commons, the existing government or cabinet must either resign or request a dissolution from the Governor General.

Now, this document is the "family bible" of my hon. friend and a great many people in Canada. Possibly he might see fit to correct this particular passage because as it stands now it is of no value; it is worthless.

Let us examine with clarity, Mr. Speaker, what the result would be if the motion which the government is asking us to accept should be passed. I should like to refer to a very pertinent point made by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Patterson). This motion contains within its four corners superfluous and gratuitous phrases which seek to suggest, as the hon. member for Fraser Valley said, that all members of this house who participated in the previous proceedings with regard to this bill had accepted the bill. In part, the wording of the motion is as follows:

That this house does not regard its vote on February 19th in connection with third reading of Bill C-193, which had carried in all previous stages—

Mr. Speaker, there was no necessity to include these last words in this motion. If these words are to be included, then why not also include the further words, "which in all its previous stages had been opposed vigorously by all members of the opposition parties"? Why not include a statement to the effect that this party and some of the other opposition parties had vigorously and consistently opposed the financial program of this government initiated by the mini-budget of the Minister of Finance last November, and that this party and other opposition parties had consistently advanced the proposition that the government has mismanaged the affairs of this country and has not been able to do those things which need to be done in order to advance the interests of the people of Canada? Why not include those words in the motion? I suggest this is a deliberate attempt, a sly and cunning attempt to deceive the people of Canada with respect to what will be the result of this motion, if passed.