## Motion Respecting House Vote

Now we come to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Let us consider some of the interesting observations he made while in Halifax. He said then that the time has come when we must have strong leadership. If there is unity in the Liberal party, why was he reflecting on the leadership of the present Prime Minister? Some of these points were already made by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Horner). I repeat again that on occasions when the government was on trial, its members were not here to defend themselves. They are not rising now to refute the charges that are made against them, and there is no doubt that when they speak of this unity, it is only lip service and malarky, which they are passing on to the Canadian people.

In saying that, I do not intend to forget the Minister of Trade and Commerce about whom I have a few interesting observations to make. All this nonsense which the Prime Minister spewed to the television audience over the week end, is nothing but a dishonest approach to the whole matter.

I know that the word "lie" is not permitted in the house and is considered unparliamentary. One is not supposed to say that a member is lying. I do not propose to do so now, but let me say that a precedent has been established when members on the government side have been charged in the house with lying and they did not have the gumption to rise and defend themselves. The Canadian people are faced today with one big lie.

As I was saying, I have some interesting observations to make about the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who I think by this time should consider it proper to rise in the house defend his position. Several quotations have been made from the Canada Year Book, one of which has been repeated several times in relation to the minister's statement concerning fiscal integrity. All I can say is that here again the government is selling something to the Canadian people for \$5 a shot, and they cannot back up what they put in writing. Now the integrity of the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been called into question, as has the integrity of the Minister of Finance with regard to the Canadian economy. It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this man who once stated outside the house that he closed more mines in Canada than any other man, also stated that heat either. This is the man who is supposed Sydney was not an economic unit and therefore should not receive any assistance from this government. This is the man who went to heard a word from him in this house, he has [Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South).]

India and lent the Indian government \$20 million, but refused to lend half of that amount to the people of Nova Scotia to cope with a problem with which he is quite familiar.

## • (9:50 p.m.)

It is also interesting to note. Mr. Speaker. that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) went before an audience of 20,000 people or more in Cape Breton this summer and said the government was searching desperately for a way to help. When the government of Nova Scotia pointed out the way to help, this government flatly refused to come through. The Minister of National Health and Welfare, although paying lip service to the people of Cape Breton, has not accepted his responsibilities any more than the Prime Minister has. I see the minister over there in his seat. I might say also that when the earlier vote was taken last week I drew to the Chairman's attention the fact that the Minister of National Health and Welfare had slipped in and voted illegally along with a few other Liberals. I would say therefore they stole one vote that day, and lost the other two.

It is regrettable that so many cabinet ministers are absent. I would have liked to give the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs (Mr. Turner) a chance to rise again. However, it seems these ministers only get to their feet when they think they have a question of privilege. They do not have the intestinal fortitude to get up and defend their position. How many ministers or members on that side have defended the position of this government? As a matter of fact, it is rumoured the hon, member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart) has stated outside the house that he agrees with the position taken by the opposition, and that the Prime Minister should have gone to the Governor General.

As I say, it is regrettable that so many of the ministers who should be defending this government are not present. The other evening when the leader of the New Democratic party was speaking he made some reference to the Minister of Finance. Then he spoke about another minister, and the moment he referred to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) that minister jumped up and ran from the house. He could not stand the to be operating on a much higher plane, as a constitutional expert. However we have not