

Canadian Economy

the bridge of the *Titanic* and saying, "Ice provokes more problems".

● (2050)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: "Strikes create more unemployment"! What a great comment was that from the Minister of Finance. I wish the minister could find it in his residue of decency—and I think there is a substantial residue of decency there—to disassociate himself from the sham aspects of the government's alleged pursuit of consensus. I say quite frankly that I do not think we can afford the luxury of this kind of game. Tempers are flaring, and it is not only my patience that has worn out. It is time that the government came clean with the Canadian people.

The minister always gets upset whenever there is any suggestion that he is not fully and frankly taking the House and the country into his confidence. He may try to make a show of righteous indignation in this situation, but he must recognize that in this case the emperor has no clothes.

The minister will not undertake to give us a report prior to an Easter break. He refuses to give us any such assurance, and after that he will be going abroad in April. After a couple of postponements he will only say now that we can expect some report on this consensus program at an appropriate time. I do not need to remind him of Lord Keynes' remark that, "In the long run we will all be dead".

I am sorry, I cannot hear my hon. friend—

Mr. Railton:—help to get that bill through.

Mr. Stanfield: Madam Speaker, I do not know what bill my hon. friend is referring to—I do not know of any bill before the House that is going to make very much difference in saving the economy.

My hon. friend probably knows the name at least of the eminent psychiatrist and author, Dr. Eric Berne, who wrote about people waiting for death or Santa Claus. If the Minister of Finance thinks we can afford to wait for some Santa Claus recovery, particularly the recovery of the United States, he should tell us that and cut out the dishonesty of stalling and telling stories. If the minister really has something to offer as a proposal on which he is seeking a consensus from the principal elements in our economy he should say what it is, and get on with it.

Mr. Railton: He has told you. Just wait for about three months and you will see the effects.

Mr. Epp: We will all be broke.

Mr. Stanfield: Great stuff.

Mr. Epp: From when do you start counting, Vic?

Mr. Stanfield: Madam Speaker, I think I have now had confirmation from the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton) of what I have said—that the Minister of Finance and the whole bunch over there are engaged in a con game. All the talk about consensus is only a stalling device. They say if we will just wait three or four months everything will work out well because things are going to recover in

[Mr. Stanfield.]

the United States. I could not have had more confirmation of what I have been saying.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman but the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Stanfield: No, Madam Speaker, I do not want extra time. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton) made my point for me.

Mr. Cullen: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, there have been discussions and I believe it is agreed that a House order could be made that the addresses between now and ten o'clock be limited to ten minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. It is agreed that the addresses from now on be limited to ten minutes?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Alan Martin (Scarborough West): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this debate on the motion sponsored by the house leader of the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). He and his party are proposing, as I understand it, that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner), having brought two budgets before this House in a period of six months, should now bring a third.

Mr. Howie: A real one.

Mr. Martin: The budget of last spring was overwhelmingly endorsed by the Canadian electorate who, thanks to the party now led in this House by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, were given the opportunity to express their viewpoint in the most basic and direct method known within our democratic system.

If my recollection is correct, Madam Speaker, that particular budget and the ensuing activity resulted in the party of the hon. member losing 50 per cent of its representation in this House. The second budget has not produced the same kind of redistribution of the membership of this House only because I submit the opposition of the New Democratic Party to the November 18 budgetary measures could not at this time bring the country and the government to a standstill. Had its opposition to Bill C-49 been adequate to defeat once again the duly elected government of this country I suggest that once again the electorate would have overwhelmingly supported the government, and those responsible for voting against the budgetary measures would have suffered a second calamity at the polls. Who knows how many representatives of that same party would now be with us?

Bearing these factors in mind, Madam Speaker, can they be serious in wanting a third budget at this time, which obviously they would be duty bound to vote against? I can hardly believe that. Therefore I must conclude that there is a degree of hollowness in this motion before us. I believe it is largely a ploy on the part of the NDP to take more of the time of this House to continue debate on the budgetary measures included in Bill C-49, and this after days and