

Motion Respecting House Vote

on December 6, is increase the disparities in this country. The provinces east of the Ottawa river, to use the phrase uttered by the premier of Newfoundland during the federal-provincial conference on the constitution, will suffer unemployment to a higher degree and to a greater proportionate extent than the provinces west of the Ottawa river. Not only do you do harm to the economy across the country, but you do particular harm to the five provinces east of the Ottawa river which can least tolerate or least accept it.

I say, Mr. Speaker—and this is why we voted against the bill last Monday and why we will vote against the motion today—that the economic and financial policies of the government will inevitably result in a continued increase in the already high cost of living, in a drop in the rate of growth in Canada, in continually increasing unemployment, with the social frustration and the loss of revenues to this government and to other governments that this will bring.

On Friday the Minister of Finance accused the leader of my party of self assurance, and may I say having made that statement in a not very assured way he then proceeded not only with self assurance but with limitless arrogance to say to this house "You may have defeated the bill I presented to you last Monday night, but I give you warning now you will have, not of course the same bill but a similar bill, as soon as I can get it ready." He talks about self assurance. He has the nerve to accuse someone else of knowing exactly where he is going while even a decision of parliament does not chasten him and does not make him change his policies.

I have no doubt that within ten days this house will be presented with another measure which in some form will place an increased tax upon the individual taxpayers of this country; and we shall fight it with all the strength at our command, as we fought the last one no matter—what is the word that was used by a very highly placed and respected gentleman in this house?—no matter what trickery may be used to get around the decision of a week ago. Any attempt to increase taxes on individuals in Canada at this time is in our view contrary to the interests of the country, contrary to the interests of the people, and we shall fight against it with all the strength we have.

We opposed Bill C-193, as I have said, and we oppose this motion of confidence in the government. We have not changed our minds. We believe we were right then and that we

will be right now, because it is our conviction that the government's economic and financial policies are ruinous for Canada, for Canada's future, and are a threat to the new adherents to our labour force through unemployment. We believe that the manpower retraining program is bound to be inadequate, as it has already proved to be inadequate. The larger the unemployment problem becomes the less will the Minister of Manpower and Immigration be able to do to retrain people. These economic and financial policies threaten the future of the young people of Canada. Therefore we opposed the bill a week ago and we will vote against this motion, I hope today.

[Translation]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I will try today to use the simplest and most familiar words so that the journalists, first of all, and the population in general will understand clearly how we see the present motion.

I would not like to keep the house too long by indulging in digressions as some other speakers did before me. For hours we have been hearing quotations dating back 40, 50, 100 years and even more to prove that the procedure followed was not in accordance with the thinking of the fathers of confederation or the British tradition, while the members of the government did all they could to prove the contrary.

The traditionalists should be told that many things have changed since those memorable days and that our great-great-grandparents would find it very difficult to recognize the practice today even if the laws they enacted were recognized.

What are they hoping to prove, through all these repetitious speeches which finally get on our nerves, to the people who want action on the part of their representatives? Do they want to prove that the government has no right to act as it just did? That is their opinion? Very well, we respect it even if we do not always understand their personal reasons. I think that to describe their state of mind better, I would need a truth detector in order to know for sure what took place in their mind in the evening of February 19 or what they are now turning over in their mind.

But what can I do, Mr. Speaker. We have simultaneous translation here but no detector. Let us hope that that will come some day.

Mr. Speaker, these people should bear in mind that we also have our reasons to vote for or against the present measure and that,