

out which cause such tremendous upset and disruption to the lives of individual Canadians.

I should remind the minister that in the United States the Internal Revenue Service is required, any time it brings forth any changes equivalent to those in this budget, to hold public hearings. Following such hearings, the IRS is required to make a report to Congress, and it is on that basis that Congress acts.

Canada is doing it the wrong way round. Here we have the minister making a statement, setting an effective date on budget night, putting himself in a position where he cannot be pushed unless the tremendous groundswell of public opinion that we experienced over the past two months pushes him off the positions he has taken. This is the nature of the system right now. It must be changed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. There is a bit of difficulty. The hon. member's time has expired. I have allowed him a few minutes extra because I was under the impression that he may wish to present a subamendment. I do not know whether that is the hon. member's intention or not. However, if it is his intention, then the procedural solution to the problem would be for him to put the subamendment as quickly as possible and I can then extend his time by an additional ten minutes. If it is not his intention to present a subamendment, then I have to give him notice that his time has expired and perhaps he can wrap up his remarks in the next moment or two.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, you are clairvoyant. I do have a subamendment. It is an amendment that I felt was necessary to amend the New Democratic Party amendment. I believe that what the NDP has proposed in its amendment does require further study. The impact of what the NDP has proposed on the housing industry is not at all clear. It is for that reason that I move, seconded by the hon. member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling):

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following:

"Provided that before final implementation these measures shall be put forward and elaborated in a white paper on government economic policy which shall be referred to a special committee of this House, with power to travel and hear representations from Canadians".

Let me wind up my remarks by drawing a broad conclusion. This budget has clearly undermined many worth-while policy objectives. It has undermined the will on the part of individuals to save and prepare for the future. It has undermined the ability of businesses to exist, to succeed and to create growth in this country. It has undermined the voluntary sector. It has undermined many of the productive elements in our society. It is ominous that this should happen when the government is preparing to be more interventionist with its reorganization which places under the umbrella of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gray)—I believe that is still his title today—the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. That will involve a much greater degree of intervention, of direct hands-on, big-lever pulling by one minister who is well known to be a very interventionist thinker.

Supply

In addition, we have the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Begin) making ominous noises about a greater degree of government participation and control of the pension industry.

Let me leave hon. members with the following thought. In 1975 the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that the market system was not working. He said that we would have to become used to more government involvement and more government intervention in our lives. Many people at that time spoke out in opposition to that sentiment and the Prime Minister backed down. But this budget, when taken in the context of other things that have happened, other policy initiatives that have been instituted by this Liberal Party over the past few years, including the National Energy Program last year, indicates that what the Prime Minister said, and from which he backed down, is part of the underlying thrust and direction of this government.

This budget itself represents the greatest effort to undermine the private sector and to create a vacuum into which government will move, because it will say the private sector is not doing the job and that the government must step in and do it. There will be more government in our lives arising out of this budget than anything we have seen in the past ten or 20 years.

I ask you this question, Mr. Speaker: was this budget sheer stupidity on the part of the government or is it part of a desire by the government to undermine a successful economy and bring on an unprecedented amount of government intervention in our lives? Whatever the answer in either case, this budget should be withdrawn.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is the President of the Privy Council rising on a point of order with respect to the acceptability of the subamendment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Exactly, Mr. Speaker, I refer to Standing Order 61.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Perhaps I can save the President of the Privy Council from the difficulty. I will hear hon. members who may wish to make contributions on the subject of whether or not the subamendment is in order. I will first read it and then I will read a citation from Beauschene. I think the House will possibly want to come to the same conclusion the Chair has, and that is that the subamendment is out of order. The subamendment reads:

That the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following:

"Provided that before final implementation these measures shall be put forward and elaborated in a white paper on government economic policy which shall be referred to a special committee of this House, with power to travel and hear representations from Canadians".

I refer to Beauschene's fourth edition, Citation 202(3), which refers to and deals with the matter of subamendments. It reads: