

*The Budget—Mr. Scott*

understanding from this government, and while veterans of wars that Canada fought in order that we may choose our own way of life and government ask for more assistance, this government chooses a path that leads still more people to the poorhouse.

While we debate this budget the government is busy thinking up new departments and agencies that it might establish. When we press for answers as to why we need these agencies or departments, we are accused of obstructionism. The only justification for these new agencies that we can find is that the government needs to provide new havens for party hacks and followers.

It seems strange to me, Mr. Speaker, and it must seem strange to some government backbenchers, that we can provide funds for hippies and agitators to do their thing, people who would not take up arms against an invader if he was about to cross the Rideau, yet we cannot find the funds with which to alleviate the suffering of men who went to foreign lands to keep the demagogues away from our shores.

Here was a perfect opportunity for the government to do something for these people, and something must be done. Remedial action for the plight of these veterans, many of whom are destitute, is long overdue. Why could not the government have done something in this budget to solve problems such as those facing the elderly and the veterans, instead of acclaiming proudly that all we are capable of creating at this time is more unemployment, more suffering.

Who is this government to tell us that prosperity is too good for the Canadian people? Who is this government to tell us that there is not enough wealth in this country to provide even the minimum requirements of its people? With a majority in the House, with the largest cabinet in the history of our government, with the largest budget since Confederation, this government cannot solve the simple problems basic to human survival and human dignity.

● (5:40 p.m.)

The obvious inability of the government to cope with social and economic issues in a manner which would benefit the Canadian individual was illustrated graphically last year by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) during the debates on Standing Order 75C. The hon. member said that the government could not

boast about how much legislation they had passed while at the same time complaining about opposition obstructionism. We still hear both overt and covert complaints from the government benches that we on this side of the House are obstructing important legislation. I throw down the glove to the government. I challenge them to bring in one piece of important legislation, so that we can all get down to the business of passing laws through this House which will provide something for the Canadian citizen instead of incessantly taking something away from him.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be accused of labelling the obvious. I do not want to keep repeating what my colleagues and I have been saying ever since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took control of the destinies and the pocketbooks of the Canadian people. But if we keep repeating it often enough there is a chance, if only a slight one, that the government will come to realize that there are too many poor people in a country which can provide more than we need. The government might come to realize that the men who sacrificed their health and their promise of a productive life by fighting in our wars are more important to us than draft dodgers and deserters from other countries.

The legislation which the government claims is being obstructed is designed to allow this government to take over every segment of the Canadian economy and all the means of Canadian production. Is this the way of parliamentary democracy? If it is, then someone has written a new book on the subject. Judging from his past writings in the field of political science, I would suggest that the author of this new version of parliamentary democracy sits across the chamber surrounded by the largest and most obedient staff of ministers in the history of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the Prime Minister would like me to tell my unemployed constituents about the failure of the government to come to grips with the problems of the country. I wonder what the Prime Minister would like me to say to elderly people on fixed incomes when they ask how much longer they must wait for a little help. What shall I tell the veterans in my constituency when they ask me if anyone remembers them?

There is another area of great concern which would bear examination. I am thinking of this government's expertise in reorganizing departments and agencies. Take the Post Office as an example. This is a real gem. For