

*Motion Respecting House Vote*

precedent must be claimed by the Prime Minister in advance. There are many examples of an English prime minister saying at the beginning of a session that certain items are minor and a vote against the government in regard to them will not be a vote of confidence, and other areas are staked out as major, and the vote in regard to them will be considered a vote of confidence.

I am addressing all those seats on the government side of the house.

**An hon. Member:** They are empty now.

**Mr. Hamilton:** I put it to individual members on the government side that their honour is at stake. Is this minority government going to claim the rights of a minority government after the fact of a defeat? I maintain that you have no right to sit there now that you have been defeated on a major bill. It was a tax bill and important to the government's budget. I ask, by what right, in pure logic and pure justice, can the government continue to sit with honour?

I shall now cite an authority higher than any that have been cited in this debate so far. I cite the authority of a man who has done more to wreck this country, to wreck national unity and to wreck parliament than any single man in our history. I refer to the man who, basically, is the cause of this mess, a man who has no strength of will and who has destroyed his ministers right and left instead of taking the blame when anything goes wrong. I shall now quote the words of the man who holds the office of Prime Minister.

On April 23, 1963, just after the election, he appeared on national television, the media of medias where truth is evident in the face of a speaker. These are the Prime Minister's words when waiving his right to the protection that a minority government must sometimes seek:

My government is just short of a clear majority. I do not complain about that. It is my resolve not to allow the lack of such a clear majority to influence the government in any way that will weaken its action for you. We will not be seeking to evade any issues, to avoid any votes in parliament. We will not be seeking any special deals. We will breach no trust, barter no principles.

**An hon. Member:** Better listen, Trudeau.

**Mr. Hamilton:** These words are from the official communiqué of the broadcast script for April 23, 1963. If that newly elected Prime Minister had not been so cocky, so arrogant, so stupid, he could have asked the Canadian people to bear with him so that if he were

[Mr. Hamilton.]

defeated on minor matters—that is one of the hazards of a minority government—he would not have to go to the country.

I have read the Prime Minister's statement on April 23, 1963. In it he outlined his minority government's position. But now he asks us to treat him as a minority government Prime Minister and to absolve him from his waiving of his rights. When he returned from Jamaica he was petulant and angry and he put on an awful display on television in blaming his whip and so on. In the house he blamed the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and he waved his finger at the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) for leading him astray in his thinking. He blamed everybody but himself. When that petulance was over he got the Minister of Justice (Mr. Trudeau) to stand up in the house and say, "But this was a minor, technical matter of a 5 per cent surtax." It was on top of last year's tax increase.

On top of that the Prime Minister says, "We are going to get this money somehow." The Minister of Finance also says, "We are going to get that money." Somebody went to the Créditistes and told them that if they voted confidence the tax would not be reimposed. I say to them: Whom are you going to believe? Are you going to believe what you have been told or what you have heard in this house? Are you going to believe what has been put out on television, radio and in the newspapers, that the Minister of Finance intends in some way to get that tax and a lot more from you? Any Créditiste and any other member who votes confidence in this government will not only lose his honour but will be voting for additional taxes as soon as this government can find a way of bringing them in. Never forget that.

It has been said that societies in the western world can only be ruled by precedents or by military might. This afternoon the Minister of Justice refused to accept precedents that say that defeat on major money bills brings down governments. Instead he gave us a snivelling little argument, which was pure sophistry, that the vote was a minor, technical matter involving third reading. There was nothing to it. If the Liberal party at its convention next April has the attitude of the Minister of Justice, God help Canada.

We live in a day when government is mixed up with business to a tremendous extent. Parliament must consider adopting modern practices. The hon. members for Parry Sound-Muskoka and Winnipeg North