

Prime Minister can only psyche us into further harmful inflationary expectations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I think it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the psychological side of inflation, the expectation aspect. This, of course, is why my colleagues and I continue to propose and urge, now more than ever, the adoption of a temporary program of across the board control of prices and incomes to give Canadians a breathing space in which we can all dedicate ourselves to squeezing a great deal of these inflationary expectations out of our economy. Surely we can do this for ourselves in a way which takes account of our trading interrelationship with the world but does not see us slavishly hand-wringing and saying, "It's the world, you know. There is nothing we can do about it." There is no easy, simplistic solution to inflation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I have persistently and consistently stated that we do not propose controls as a cure-all but as one measure, a necessary measure at this time, among others. Surely we have sufficient will and ability as Canadians to do something about our own domestic inflation. I believe we can, and I know that we would if we had at the centre of our national affairs an administration with enough imagination and enough intestinal fortitude to risk its own comfortable position in the course of putting forth an honest effort.

The Prime Minister blames the official opposition for the failure of the government to act in the last session. His first version in this blame game was that the Progressive Conservative Party somehow stonewalled Bill C-125, resulting in its not being passed. Yesterday he suggested we were divided on the bill and this is why it did not move forward. I am confident that if the Prime Minister thought we were divided on the bill, he would not have brought it forward in the first place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The bill was presented for first reading and soon thereafter, for perfectly sincere reasons, my friends in the New Democratic Party indicated they would not support it and would vote against it. Shortly after that the bill was dropped. There were no conversations with me or my House leader to determine what our attitude toward the bill might be. The government simply shelved the bill, and later in the session the minister emphasized that there was never any need for the bill anyway. As to the bill itself, I agree with the minister because it was largely a cosmetic operation. We want to see a full-scale, independent inquiry into the unemployment insurance program.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I am not talking about a witch-hunt and I am certainly not talking about some kind of internal review. I want to see an inquiry which really gets to the roots of the program and comes up with real answers to a number of basic questions relating to the administration.

The Address—Mr. Stanfield

Are the fears expressed about abuses justified? Are the claims made by many that they wait long periods for benefits justified? Is there adequate co-ordination between the unemployment insurance administration and Manpower? Are there disincentives to work built into today's unemployment insurance program? In asking that question, I would disagree with what the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) said here today. If there are, they are not the only kind. That is not the point.

Are there disincentives built into this program? If so, what are they and what should be done about it? These are surely legitimate, vital questions to be asked about a new program which in its first couple of years of operation has been costing an amount equivalent to an annual levy of \$100 per head for every man, woman and child in the country instead of the \$20 which was forecast by the government at the time the measure was presented to the House.

I spoke of cosmetics a minute ago. Cosmetics always suggests theatrics to me. We have seen some dazzling displays of theatrics by the government in its pursuit of the politics of energy. The amazing orchestra involved in this performance was placed very prominently on the stage, the members not feeling comfortable down in the pit. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) moved from the fiddle, to the drum, to the trumpet in arranging and rearranging his own orchestration. While the minister was moving about in this virtuoso fashion, the Prime Minister kept changing the music on the stands.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The Minister of Finance made an appearance once in a while, usually on small percussion instruments, notably the triangle. The fellow who really brightened up things was the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer). This re-emergence into the public spotlight was highlighted by the minister's expressed intention to get the oil out of the Alberta tar sands at an even faster rate than many of his former charges used to get out of jail.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The minister sang out the praises of his own version of a CANDU, the Hermann Kahn-do.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Try that again.

Mr. Stanfield: I simply suggest that my hon. friends opposite are a little slow. I apologize for being too fast for them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1540)

Mr. Stanfield: In any case, when this disorganized show reached the first intermission, it was announced to the audience that anybody who was unappreciative was probably alienated from federalism.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!