

I believe the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) had a question. If he still thinks it is worth while, I shall be happy to try to deal with it.

Mr. Nielsen: I should like to put the question because it is nice to have a reply from an expert in constitutional matters. The hon. member cited an example in which a decision was made in committee of the whole and the house sent the particular clause back. I presume the house acted on the basis of a motion to do so. If the house had defeated that reference and the government had been defeated at that stage, would the hon. member think that would have been a motion of confidence?

Mr. Stewart: I think the answer to that is a matter of record. The Prime Minister had risen in his place and said that not only the expurgation of the amended clause but also the reinstatement of the original clause would be treated by the government as a matter of confidence. This was clearly stated in advance.

Mr. Nielsen: That being so, does it not follow that the motion in the house last Monday night would have the same effect, its having come from committee of the whole?

Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Speaker, the vote which will come on the motion now under debate is the one which will reveal the genuine attitude of this House of Commons.

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, the motion we have before us claims that a vote taken in this house last Monday on a money bill, the most important kind of bill that any parliament can have come before it, does not constitute a vote of confidence. It is the government that claims this is not a vote of confidence. I believe therefore it would be a good thing to ascertain exactly what this government, by the printed word, says ought to be the procedure in cases of this kind. I have before me the Canada Year Book for 1967.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: The Canada Year Book is described in its frontispiece as the official statistical annual of the resources, history, institutions and social and economic conditions of Canada. It is published—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hees: You are not going to be so happy when you hear what it says. It is published

Motion Respecting House Vote

each year under the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is now Hon. Robert Winters.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should be allowed to make his speech.

Mr. Hees: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This volume is produced by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This is the government's bible of what is done in Canada each year, how it is done and how it should be done. If that is not the case, then the government has no right to publish a book of this kind, making the claims that I have set out. The Minister of Trade and Commerce knows exactly what I am talking about. This book was produced under his authority. I know, because at one time it was produced under my authority. I know the care that goes into the publication of it, and I know that this book contains an outline of things as they are and as they should be in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what this government which, unfortunately, has been in office for five years and has had an opportunity to change anything in this book, has to say. I have the last installment, 1967, and when you turn to page 86 line 6, you find this is what the government says is the proper procedure in this country of ours in 1968:

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 must either resign or request a dissolution from the Governor General.

That is what this government says should be its course of conduct after the defeat of a government bill. There is no mention of a money bill; but money bills are the most important bills that come before this parliament. Having said that, and having specified exactly what the right procedure should be, this government refuses to call an election and refuses to resign. This government demands the right to stay in office, to cling to power. This Liberal party loves to cling to power. They know quite well, as a result of the last two Gallup polls, that if an election were held the country would indicate it had lost confidence in them. They would no longer be the government.

In contrast to the attitude the Liberal party adopts when in power, I should like to outline their attitude when in opposition. The Liberal party is in power today and will not resign, as its own publication indicates it must. I should like you to turn back some ten