

casts. We know the results. I believe this also is wasteful spending.

Since 1968, the government had been re-elected with 175,000 unemployed. We now have 500,000. We hear repeated every day, and we have been told again today by members opposite how often legislation was enacted, how many suggestions tendered, how many efforts and attempts made to improve the situation.

But after ten years, it is realized not only in Quebec but across Canada that the government's credibility is challenged. The public's confidence is getting dangerously low. I hope nobody will say this is our doing.

This opposition day allows us of course to stress these shortcomings, these problems, the Canadian public's concerns.

We blame the government for certain extravagant expenditures. The President of the Treasury Board said this afternoon that I myself enquired about possibilities of extra money in the area of local initiative programs.

Therefore, I was favouring extra expenditures. I think we should look at the advertisement for LIP projects. Since 80 per cent of these projects are refused because of lack of money, maybe savings could be made on advertising expenses, so that more projects may be undertaken.

I think there is much more publicity for so little results. I feel that it is an unnecessary expenditure. On the whole, the government is supposed to invest those funds judiciously. This is a proof after ten years that the social climate is unhealthy, that the people are angry and ill-disposed, even if an attempt was made recently with Bill C-73 to correct this situation.

The Canadian people have seen the government ridicule our party in the House, when we suggested controls two years ago. Four years ago, the leader of the Progressive Conservative party (Mr. Stanfield) during a trip throughout Canada asked the government to take concrete steps and even introduce strict legislation, as we were already referring to inflation control.

Therefore, we were ridiculous, Madam Speaker, but by various devices the government succeeded in frightening the people with the war measures when it was not with something else, but always under the pretext of a national crisis, they convinced the Canadian people that we were wrong.

But today, we have to admit and we do realize that the government must take action. Recently, one of our ministers resigned, the former Minister of Finance, who had obviously, according to our information, already recommended to his government certain restrictive measures. When the government failed to comply with his request on a short term, he resigned.

Recently, the government introduced Bill C-73 which corresponds in principle to a desire that we expressed a few years ago, and especially in 1974.

Already some years ago, there were discussions with reference to controls, mostly in 1974. However, the Prime Minister was perhaps a little ill at ease when he said he had negotiated with the provinces and had been assured of their support as well as that of the unions, etc.

Government Spending

● (2150)

Today still, we realize that labour organizations are setting up resistance movements, that the provinces are not in agreement. There has been no consultation, Madam Speaker. We were not assured beforehand that the co-operation of those organizations and of the provinces would obviously be a prerequisite to the implementation of the legislation. We agree in principle with control measures, though there must be some assurance that the controls can work. It was misleading information when we were told that the support of essential bodies was secured.

As this requires extensive travels in Canada by members of the government and renewed consultations without delay, considering the resistance of some organizations and provinces, I say that also is a waste of public funds. Perhaps that waste is what I want to make the government aware of, a waste which makes the people of Canada lose confidence in their government.

It is not necessarily the purchase of a Cadillac, but I think the measures introduced during the last ten years, the social context in which we live, the social climate which is terribly disrupted, are a waste on the part of the government. They have not been able to bring in legislation capable of reflecting reality and solving problems. For instance, in the area of unemployment, the government is trying more than ever before to make us accept as a fact of life an unemployment level ranging from 600,000 to 700,000. We certainly cannot accept that.

We have mentioned the possible lowering of the old age security pension entitlement age to 60, which would permit people 60 years of age to retire if they wanted to. I have felt in the past and I still do that this would open the labour market to a great many young people whom we maintain in an unemployment situation and support through social security benefits or other means. Although they carry interesting diplomas, these young people are dissatisfied because they are still unemployed. We still believe that the government should have allowed a few thousand Canadians to retire after 40-odd years of deserving work. The government is saying no to this. I think this would be a way to save a lot of money and correct the social climate. The government says not to this. Although it has taken a very shy step in respect of a group of people, the aged, it is unfair for other groups.

We shall deal with unemployment insurance again this week and we shall try, through the bill under review, to recuperate \$250 million from the pockets of the small earners. This is not the way to encourage people to believe in a sound administration. The social unrest which cannot be appeared by such measures force us, of course, to take advantage of this day to blame the government and ask it to think seriously of means to correct the situation. I am led to believe that the government has lost its head, as our people would say. It makes mistake over mistake, with the result that the public in general is not only disappointed, but also deeply worried.

Lately, in May, I cannot say that the government lied deliberately to certain groups of people, I think, for instance, of milk producers, to whom promises had been made and who lost a part of their income because of arrangements made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) or by the Canadian Dairy Commission. Their