

The Budget—Mr. R. A. Bell

persuaded me that the passage of this amendment would in any way commit the government, because it is only an expression of regret and a condemnation for failure rather than an instruction which would be binding. However, as I said, I should like to reserve judgment and allow the debate to proceed.

Mr. Regier: Mr. Speaker, we in this group are happy with your decision to reserve your ruling, but I should hope that in conjunction with your reservation our right of consultation with Mr. Speaker, in order to possibly make some minor amendments, will be maintained.

Mr. Speaker: I would not like to give that assurance. If I find anything to complain about in the amendment I will give the hon. member an opportunity to be heard further on the point of order.

Mr. Richard A. Bell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in their speeches today the two official financial critics opposite have run true to form. Caustic personal comment and tart personal jibes have been substituted for objective argument and constructive consistent reasoned discussion of fiscal and monetary policies. I would say to the house that seldom has it been treated to so much confused and disordered economic reasoning. In the 30 minutes to which I am confined I cannot hope to follow the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River down all the blind alleys, down all the tortuous by-paths of reasoning which he traversed today; but as I go along I will deal with his principal strictures, his special pleadings and, if I may say, his hair-splitting inconsistencies.

With respect to the hon. gentleman, I must say that several times in his speech his reasoning reminded me of a man who had painted himself into a corner. I say to him as well that I have never heard such a vague, hollow, lame, disjointed criticism of any budget, and that its vagueness was equalled only by its emptiness. What to me, sir, was the most extraordinary, the most incredibly fascinating fact of his whole speech was his total failure even once to mention the name "Coyne", at least that word spelled with a "y"; and further his total failure to mention really the role of monetary policy. After the uproar created in this chamber and in a certain committee of this house by an attempt of the Liberal party to get into bed with Mr. Coyne, well, the extraordinary divorce professed today passeth completely any understanding. I say to you, what a revelation of the utter bankruptcy of Liberal policy and tactics, the utter bankruptcy of the tactics which they have pursued in this chamber over the past 10 days.

How was it possible, sir, how was it conceivable, that the dissociation with Mr. Coyne could be so quickly achieved? Well, in fact it has not been or never could any party be deflated so rapidly. I wonder what Mr. Coyne will think of his erstwhile allies?

Let me say just a word on the Liberal amendment. Perhaps I should deal with the earlier parts of it. They are a collection of meaningless words and I would say a sophistical sham. Who in the house would have any question about the author of it. The house will know that the voice was the voice of Kenora-Rainy River's Jacob but the hand certainly was the hand of Bonavista's Esau.

Mr. Benidickson: The hon. member is just as wrong now as he was before.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): What an amendment. Let me read the end of it:

The government is not entitled to the confidence of the elected representatives of the people.

Well, sir, we on this side of the house will take up that challenge at any time. We are prepared to divide now or at any time. We are prepared to demonstrate now the full and unlimited confidence of those of us who sit on this side of the house in the policies of the right hon. Prime Minister and in the budget which was presented by the Minister of Finance on Tuesday night. I go further, sir, and I say that in due course the people of this country will uphold the policies which are enunciated in that budget.

Hon. gentlemen opposite suddenly in the last short while have changed their tactics. Hon. gentlemen were quiet on the first day of June in this house. Why? Because of what happened on May 31: 3 to 1 was the score in the by-elections. Yes, sir, and the score will be equivalent when the time comes in due course, whether it be in the year 1961, the year 1962 or 1963 to submit the record of this government to the people, a record of which all of us on this side of the house are especially proud.

Mr. Benidickson: You are not ready?

Mr. Bell (Carleton): In view of the fact that the C.C.F. amendment, which deals with everything except the kitchen sink, has been reserved I shall offer no comment in respect of it at the present time.

The Minister of Finance described this budget as not an ordinary one, but in more than usual measure an economic budget, and such, sir, it is. Its central design is the re-establishment of an effective partnership among fiscal, monetary and commercial policies. Only on that firm footing, on that partnership, can there be built what the Minister of Finance described as a comprehensive, sound and responsible economic