

Time Allocation

to introduce another budget before we finish with the legislation of past budgets. That is reasonable, and I think most Canadians accept it.

We have not pulled surprises. We have clearly told Canadians the general thrust of our program, our tax policy and our spending through the Estimates for the coming year. We have had a lot more information through the pre-budget consultations, the Finance Committee hearings and the debate on Bill C-139, the Income Tax Act.

Finance matters are the focus of parliamentary activity at this time. I was astonished to hear a Member of the Opposition stand up and say that he does not get enough information about the Government's work. That Member must be on a holiday. He must be living in some kind of cave. We have done nothing but talk about finances, budgets and the Government's general financial direction since last June.

We have all kinds of other legislation to deal with, but we have not been able to pay attention to it. Why? Because the Government has made finance and our response to the recession the number one priority, and the Opposition knows it. There is no reason why any dutiful, hard-working Member on the other side would not know what we are doing.

We do not know what they are doing. I have looked at the record of what the Opposition said today. It was a little hobby to while away the hours listening to the speeches. I thought it would be interesting to tell people what we heard from the ranks opposite.

Early this morning the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), a distinguished Member of the House, told us not to tax so much. That chorus was joined in by a lot of other singers because we were discussing the Income Tax Bill. The Members were eloquent indeed about the terrible tax burden this Government supposedly is putting on the people. They said in conclusion, "Don't tax so much".

We then heard from the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney). She thinks we should cut the deficit, that we should not borrow so much. They tell us we should not tax so much and we should not borrow so much. There are several people in the Barnum and Bailey Circus running for the leadership of their Party who are saying, "Don't borrow so much". We have those two positions undeniably from the Tories.

In questions from the other side during today's Question Period we were asked why we do not spend more on health care, transfers to the Provinces, women's issues, and research and development. In one day alone we opened up billions of dollars worth of opportunity. The Tory position was made eminently clear today: Spend lots of money, but don't tax and don't borrow to get that money. Lord knows where it will come from, but it is the Tory magic program. It is a very attractive one. I would like to find out how they plan to carry it out. We look forward to the details on that.

Our friends on the left, our bosom buddies in the NDP, as they are said to be, do not have an idea at all. Their position on the borrowing authority has been completely procedural. They

say they do not like the way we are going about it. They do not say anything about what we are doing, not one word. I must correct that. The Hon. Member for Kootenay-East Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) told us that he would like to see us spend a little more money to kick drunks off trains. He went on from there to give us a very good and, I thought, heartfelt dissertation on transport policy in his riding. That was a good discussion and I can remember it clearly because it was the only good discussion I have heard from his Party. We have not had any discussion from the New Democratic Party about the direction they want to follow.

● (1700)

Their Leader, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), said a short while ago that he wanted to cut the deficit. I remember that clearly. It was shocking to all of us who felt that the deficit was one of the rocks of the NDP. We felt that they could always be counted on to support us in this debate, but, no, there was the Hon. Member for Oshawa saying, "cut the deficit". Now we do not know, any more than we know from the Tories, whether the NDP wants to cut the deficit by lowering our borrowing, lowering our taxes or lowering our spending. All we know is that they do not like the way we are going about it. We do not know where they would go or what they would do, otherwise.

In fact, we heard from the NDP spokesman on finance matters today that he dissociates himself from the view that the private sector will lead us to a recovery.

Mr. Deans: That's right.

Mr. Fisher: I hear them saying, that's right. How does that fit in with his Leader's view that we should cut the deficit? Would he like us to leave it all up to the private sector and cut the deficit, or would he like us to add some to the deficit and lay off the private sector? We would like to hear some of these opinions from him.

We would also like to hear a little less about the procedural stuff and a little more information such as we got from the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke telling us where he wants to go. We want a few ideas on principles, and a little less of this hollow procedural stuff. We will look forward, in the days to come, to some debate along that line from both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): I always enjoy listening to the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher). He is one of the more eloquent Members of this House. And today, Sir, not only have we had the opportunity to listen to that hon. gentleman, but we also listened to his colleague, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). In fact, Mr. Speaker, if there has been any hijacking of Parliament done these days, it has certainly been done by the two Hon. Members from Mississauga who have just about monopolized today's debate.

What I wanted to say in this brief time which is available to me is that this imposition of closure, this use of the guillotine,