

four years of free spending, to intervention in the marketplace by the Liberal government, to more waste, more patronage and more spending of money which has nothing to do whatsoever with increasing the economic base of Canada and the welfare of Canadians.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) outlined programs not too long ago which involved millions of dollars of expenditure to help make jobs available for people. I say that expenditures do nothing at all to strengthen the economic base of our nation.

I realize that under the present government such band-aid measures may be necessary, but they are no substitute for policies that will strengthen the ability of our country to finance its operations and to promote a strong and vibrant economy in Canada.

I believe I indicated that I did not intend to speak for too long because my colleagues have presented in detail the various objections that we have to this type of program. They have called attention to a great many of the issues that are involved in it. However, I want to say very clearly today that I support wholeheartedly the opposition that has been raised against this bill. We believe that if we are going to develop our economy and we are to place Canada in a position where it can go forward and progress, develop and expand the economy, increase productivity and provide for the needs of the Canadian people without bankrupting the country, then we will have to move in a different direction altogether.

May I say that when my party was in office one of the major goals was to move the country in that direction. It was diametrically opposed to the direction in which previous governments and the government of today leans. So I think in this matter of make-work programs, although they may be necessary at times, we must have policies which will contribute to this particular objective. The programs which have been put in place are an acknowledgement by the government that they do not have those policies in mind and are not able to implement them.

One of the reasons we have raised such objection to this particular measure at this time is that the government has refused to bring in a budget. It has been recommended, urged and demanded that we have a budget, yet we find that up to the present time the government has failed to indicate its intention to bring in a budget at any specific time. Nor has it given us any hope that a budget will be introduced in the near future.

At page 160 of *Hansard* the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) stated:

I will certainly bring in a budget as soon as possible, but I do not see that possibility within the near future, or even beyond the near future.

I suggest that this is blatant arrogance of the highest degree. It seems to me I accepted the premise when I came to this House many years ago that a budget must be introduced. It was expected and it was required in every Parliament in order for the government to have the opportunity to give an overview of the Canadian scene and to say what it intended to do about

it, along with presenting its expenditures and revenues so that we are able to assess the programs and the viability of the legislation.

But here we find the Minister of Finance saying that he cannot see even in the near future or beyond that the necessity of bringing in a budget. I think the Minister of State for Finance when he was introducing this measure on third reading today said "if there is to be a budget this fall". I notice that the minister does not object, so I would assume I am correct. I repeat, he said "if there is to be a budget." I find it incredible that a government would take the position that a budget is not necessary, that it is not an important thing, or that we should not be making any fuss about it. It seems that the attitude is that the government will bring in a budget when it wants to bring it in, and if it does not want to bring in a budget, the government will be in no hurry to do so. This kind of thing leaves us up in the air, as it were, as far as the government's assessment of the situation in Canada is concerned and what the government is going to do about it.

I say that is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. A lot of traditions have been thrown out from this place, but this is an absolutely essential one. Maybe it is constitutional; maybe the government has to bring a budget in; but nevertheless the government is taking the attitude that it is inconsequential and that we ought to be able to tell the government to go ahead and borrow, borrow, borrow, and spend, spend, spend, as my colleague has just said, and that we should not have anything to say about it. I say it is not good enough, and I certainly oppose this bill at the present time.

Mr. Mazankowski: Five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. It being five o'clock, as the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has suggested, may I deal with one or two matters which the Chair has responsibility to deal with at this point.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster)—Employment—Programs to create jobs; the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty)—Computers—Use by government of Databanks; the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong)—Health and Welfare—Health hazards in certain chemicals and pesticides—Review of drugs, pesticides, food additives request for progress report.