

The Budget—Mr. Lundrigan

through elimination or lowering of what really is taxable income.

The result of this, for the benefit of my NDP colleagues, is that there would be a further billion dollar incentive in the Canadian economy. Perhaps the leader of the NDP might ask, "What's a billion?" Unlike my colleagues across the way, we say this type of expansion with another billion dollars in the economy would have a very beneficial effect. Given the fact that we have that kind of expansion, we have agreed that it would be of little avail to have that kind of expansionary policy on the one hand and on the other hand to have some kind of system of inflation that would eat away the real value to the consumer.

We are taking a stand which I believe is dramatic in Canadian history. We have said that given that type of expansionary approach on the one hand, we would be prepared to impose a 90-day freeze on prices and wages in this country, with one or two exceptions. It was indicated that by using the 90 days as a short-term approach, with consultation which we believe to be absolutely essential with the provinces, unions, consumer groups and other groups in Canada, we could come up with guidelines that would satisfy many of the question marks people have in their minds.

• (2130)

We realize that there are many question marks. I have heard my colleagues in the House and people in various groups talk about the many problems that are raised when prices and wages are frozen or controlled. With this in mind, we have recommended a 90-day freeze, with proper consultation for longer term planning. With this combination I can stand here tonight before members of the House, and I will stand anywhere in Canada, and say to my friends in the NDP and to the voters for the NDP—and gain votes with this kind of approach—that this will have a beneficial effect on the Canadian nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: I spoke earlier of the time in May of 1972 when we had the man from the east coming before us with his cosmetic kit. That is what we saw last Monday evening. He presented Canadians with a beautiful make-up job, with all the rouges, eyebrow-pencils and all the stuff that some ladies put on their faces—and perhaps some gentlemen too, for all I know. He painted this beautiful face; he did a good face-lifting job. This is what he gave us. We say that a face-lifting job is inadequate. We say that now, in 1973, after five years of this type of approach, we need a body building effort and that is what we have offered the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: That is what we have offered them in the program outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Don Valley and the hon. member for Edmonton West. In conclusion, just in case there are any members to my left who did not understand what I have just said and what we have been saying in the last week and in the last four years, I should like to say something for the record. I can hardly believe that politics can get

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

down to this level and that this is the approach of my friends to the left who have spoken the same language that we speak on this side of the House. Here we have the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent). We know where he will be, depending on the way he votes tonight.

An hon. Member: He will be in Oshawa.

Mr. Lundrigan: It sounds as if he is getting homesick. I want to say, in conclusion, that tonight will be a real test of the position of individual members of the NDP. I predict that a good number of the members of that party—I do not know exactly how many—will realize the calling that was referred to again by my colleague, the hon. member for Provencher, and stand up for their principles. I predict that some members of that party will stand on their convictions rather than follow the lack of leadership given by the hon. member for York South.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: I want to read again the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton West and that of the Minister of Finance on which they will be voting. The motion reads:

That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

The hon. member for Edmonton West moved an amendment that all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

while acknowledging certain beneficial provisions in the budget proposals, this House regrets that they do not contain measures that will substantially reduce continuing high unemployment, effectively contain the spiralling cost of living or provide any incentives to Canadians to increase their participation in Canadian business enterprise and development.

That motion should provide no difficulty for members who are interested in the future development of our nation to support the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, I regret missing a few minutes—I hope it was only a few minutes—of the beginning of the address of the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) who is obviously one of the better debaters in the House of Commons. He showed very early in his remarks—at least when I was in the House—a real and sincere concern for the effects of unemployment. He spoke eloquently and with conviction about the dramatic and the traumatic effects which unemployment has on family life.

He pointed out something that most of us who remember the depression years know, namely, the degradation that the father or the chief breadwinner feels when he is out of work through no fault of his own. He spoke with great feeling about the effects of unemployment. He could have gone on to describe the 1930s as I did the other day, the soup kitchens, the bread lines and my community which the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) knows so well, where people burned their cupboard doors in the winter in order to prevent the pipes from freezing and to provide some heat.