

Motion Respecting House Vote

After the crucial vote on Monday night the government was asked to resign, but they said they wanted to continue on and do business. A motion to adjourn moved by the hon. member for Kamloops carried, 79 to 78. Again the government was defeated. The house had agreed on that Monday night that the government should resign. Yet on Tuesday the Prime Minister came back from a Jamaican trip, no doubt with some choice words to say to his cabinet colleagues, and he was willing to carry on. What he said to his cabinet does not matter; the point is this: Can the government carry on illegally? Has not the Prime Minister a moral obligation to govern this country according to the wishes of its elected representatives? The elected representatives said that the government ought to resign.

You cannot have a replay in important votes. Politics is not hockey. If the recent hockey match between Finland and Canada were replayed I expect that Canada would collect the silver medal, instead of the bronze medal that it did collect. The Prime Minister will come out of this series, and retire from public life with a tarnished brass medal. He has shown poor sportsmanship and he has not accepted his moral obligation of governing properly, the moral obligation he assumed when he donned the mantle of Prime Minister of this country.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce went around western Canada saying that the cabinet is divided and the country is split. He added that we are in a financial crisis, and is reported to have said "I am not going to enter this leadership race." He said he was getting out of it. But he was the Acting Prime Minister on Monday and he allowed his colleagues to go down to defeat deliberately, because he had no confidence in them himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I have expressed myself on that matter a number of times and on another occasion I shall cite more fully exactly what he is reported to have said. His remarks are tantamount to saying that he had no confidence in his fellow cabinet ministers, and had no intention to run for leader.

The very essence of democracy is that there shall be no taxation without representation. Yet what does this government do? It does the opposite. Though defeated, it says to all of us that we shall pay illegal taxes. Though the 5 per cent surtax is illegal, we are to

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

continue paying it, and the Minister of Finance has absolutely no conscience about the matter. He says that the tax is not to be returned to the people. The other day I listened to him making an incredibly poor defence of his position. What did he say? He whined. He took issue with the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) for making a political speech. What a terrible thing that was to do at a time of crisis.

● (9:00 p.m.)

He wanted to take credit for all the good things in Canada but argued that we should not blame the Liberal government for any of the bad things, because the whole world was in bad shape. He told us that Canada today was experiencing a boom. What kind of boom are we in? We find producers getting less for what they grow while prices to the consumer are rising by leaps and bounds. Interest rates are going up. Unemployment is going up. Taxes are going up. Yes, everything is booming now. But the Minister of Finance, in a weak effort to defend the government's position, tells us that it is not his fault; that the whole world is in a bad situation. Mr. Speaker, the economic council pointed out clearly some time ago that even though it was not burdened with the Viet Nam war Canada was in a far worse position financially than the United States. During the last few months we have witnessed a serious run on the dollar, together with soaring interest rates, while on the other hand we have been witnessing tight money and unemployment. It is certainly remarkable to find all these things happening at the same time, and one wonders why.

It is not surprising that the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not stand up that night to defend his colleagues, since he has so little confidence in them. How could he defend them? The hon. gentleman laughed at the extract from the Canada Year Book and the comments made in it. The passage referred to in that year book has appeared in the same way for the last 20 years. But there will be a change, now. That part will be changed, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce cannot deny it; he knows this is the first thing he will have to do before the next Canada Year Book is printed.

What did he say about his colleagues? He said the government was split between men of conscience and those who wished to cling to office at all costs. The minister deplored the absence of a balanced budget. Referring to the prime ministership he said he could not