

ring to the Conservatives and the Liberals. He would ask: Who is Tweedledum and who is Tweedledee? What do we have today? I suggest we still have Tweedledum, but now we just have "ho-hum" from that man who just huffs and puffs away.

We heard all about the corporate rip-off, and the leader of the NDP, (Mr. Lewis) did well in a public way. He did not do too well at the polls, and I was not too displeased about that; but he is starting to raise this matter again. He cannot raise it again with the same credibility as before. With no concerted action from coast to coast, that party does not necessarily represent an attack against corporate rip-off that is being perpetrated as a result of this unholy alliance between two groups, neither of which received a majority, neither of which has a mandate and neither of which has a message for the people from coast to coast or a message for this House during this debate on economic policy.

We have heard many speeches during this debate. The two that stand out most in my mind are those of the hon. member for Don Valley and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain. I have heard the latter member speaking privately from behind the curtain and over coffee, when he sometimes can wax eloquently, bringing forth ideas like water flowing over a falls. Today, in respect of one of the most complicated subjects, I can say without equivocation that he spoke extremely eloquently. We know that no party has the full answer, but when the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain spoke I know that members on the government benches listened to his views. Five of the ministers who were then present applauded that hon. member.

What can I say about the other speeches in the few minutes I have left at my disposal? The hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) suggested that we should not wage this war on the backs of the poor. They said that was what happened in respect of unemployment, and they were not going to do that at this time. What is just as bad as unemployment? Let us consider the erosion of the frozen dollar of the pensioner, the dollar of the working poor, and inflation itself which eats away at these funds. Is that not just as bad a social disease as unemployment? I have in mind that euphemistic phrase, "You cannot wage war on the backs of the poor".

Hon. members on the government side suggest this is an international problem. Why does Sweden have interest rates of 4 per cent and 5 per cent, with deposit interest rates of 3 per cent and 4 per cent? I suggest it is because Sweden has given stable government and leadership in economic, fiscal and monetary matters. We in Canada have more natural resources than Sweden ever thought of having, yet we continually respond as do our friends to the

south. We have not developed an independent stance and we have not attempted to develop independent policy.

The Minister of Finance talked about world shortages and the lack of production. He listed a host of palliatives used in an attempt to pump a little money into the economy, but he did not once mention the Lift program or the quota on eggs and milk which curtails production. These things have now come back home to haunt the government. With that host of palliatives and pills, with no prescription to cure the ills, one cannot help but wonder if that is not what the government should be doing to help the needy and aid the dispossessed and those who have been cut off from the mainstream of life.

Is it not the function of government to assist these needy people? Why should this government take false pride in what is a normal government function? This government suggests that its normal function of providing the pill or palliative is designed to arrest the disease. I suggest to you that the money we voted in respect of certain measures in the last week or so will amount to nothing more than wooden nickels or Monopoly money if the cancer of inflation is not arrested and cured within the next six months or a year. Anything we give these needy people will be eaten away in six months or a year, the way things are now going.

I could say much more on this subject, but in conclusion let me refer to the eloquent address of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan). I could not begin to match his remarks. However, it does seem to me that the situation comes down to what he suggested. I wish some of the ministers who sit on the treasury benches were present, but it is kind of late and it is time to go home.

If this government has the will to govern, and that is a trite phrase or cliché, I suggest there is a fundamental difference between clinging to office and exercising power. There is nothing wrong with exercising power. The responsibility of a government is to exercise power on behalf of the people. Unfortunately, at this time in Canada we have a government headed by a Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who has an instinct for survival in office but who has defaulted in the exercise of power. As the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth said, this is a government of react, recant and retreat—which is no substitute for initiative, imagination, energy and the exercise of power.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Pursuant to section 13 of Standing Order 26, I am satisfied that the debate has now concluded. Perhaps we should say an evening or a morning prayer. I therefore declare the motion carried.

This House stands adjourned until two o'clock p.m. this date, pursuant to special order adopted earlier.

At 5.31 a.m. the House adjourned, until 2 p.m., pursuant to special order made this day.