

have a new house, you will have a pink Cadillac in your yard”.

Now, the New Democratic Party, in this particular motion the hon. member puts forward is playing the old double standard game again that the New Democrats play so well.

An hon. member: You never make any promises?

Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth): The member opposite does not know when to keep his lips closed. I have just listened to him and I am trying to respond to what he said.

This motion is mischievous. This motion comes from a party that claims it is concerned about the government's cutbacks to women's programs. It claims that it is concerned about the government's cutbacks to post-secondary education and health care programs across Canada. It says this government has been wasting its money. The way it spends is misdirected. So, what does it do? It says another \$20 or \$25 million—I can hear the cash register going up and down—\$25 million—another Royal commission. That is their answer to every problem.

I thought there had been a problem with employment for some of the senior New Democrats. Well, I know that Uncle Ed got his big job over at the international centre for God knows what. We have seen other hon. members from this House, like Mr. Deans, who has now found his pork barrel heaven over at the Public Service Staff Relations Board. It is very hard to believe they were New Democrats who sat in this House. Nevertheless, when duty called and the pay cheque was big enough they certainly went.

Then we have Bob Rae in Ontario. My God, there is Uncle Bob in Ontario. Uncle Bob in Ontario came forward and said: “We have the answer to all your questions. We are a believable alternative to the current old line parties”. He got elected and what did he do? He took the economic engine of this country and he saddled it immediately after taking office with a \$10 billion deficit in the middle of a recession and has been responsible for much hardship for the average person in Ontario. Industry is claiming that because the regime that the NDP government in Ontario has put in, it is not conducive to business. If it is not conducive to business, it is conducive to the consumers, those very people that this party opposite seek to get the support of.

• (1930)

I have no difficulty in using the traditional instruments that we have before us to solve the problems that the

hon. member has mentioned. I have no quarrel with his concerns about price gouging. I have no quarrels with his statement that the GST and the government's statements on GST have been at best misleading, but that the GST has caused perhaps a window in the marketplace for abuse in the consumer price structure. I do not argue that. What I do argue for once, for goodness sakes, we are in a situation where we have debated over the last few days a very serious piece of legislation. The public servants of Canada are the people who serve every Canadian, serve every member of Parliament and make us look good. That is who we call when a constituent has a problem

We debated in here whether or not Draconian legislation to force them back to work was proper. The Liberals said no. The New Democrats said no. Let us look at the hypocrisy. The New Democratic Party said, and rightly so, the public servants deserve a much better break. However, what the New Democrats said was \$144 million is not much to pay, and it is not. Instead of coming in and debating a motion here tonight to talk about the proper allocation of limited resources over to people like the public servants of this country, who have served this country so well, what do they do? Irresponsible again. They walk in after debating that on the one hand and say: “Another \$25 million for a Royal commission, there is no problem”.

I am trying to figure out where in the name of goodness their priorities are. My priority is to help Canadians. My priority is to help my constituents. My priority is to try to ensure that legislation that goes through this place is properly directed and the limited resources hit where they should, hit most, and that is positively with the people of Canada. But no. I heard the hon. member over here just a few minutes ago. This was amazing. They always talk about the corporate welfare bums.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the hon. member used as an example as to why there should be a Royal commission? Because a Lincoln Continental costs \$10,000 more in Canada than in the United States. Can you believe that?