

*The Budget—Mr. Nielsen*

**Mr. Brown:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank my colleagues for allowing me to say a few more words.

The trend about which I spoke continued to grow through the years. Today, we often hear French spoken on the street. Indeed, the French language has become so popular that during the last election campaign, my Conservative opponent used the argument that he was bilingual, or at least, that is what he said. Later on, I myself made a speech in French over the radio. I felt that if a Conservative gave a speech in French, it was high time for me to do better.

Mr. Speaker, we are all working toward building a new Canada, a bilingual Canada, a more prestigious Canada, a Canada whose people can use two beautiful languages recognized as such by the nations of the world under the able guidance of our bilingual Prime Minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon):** The complaints of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat are legitimate but the allegations as to paternity are not. There are literally dozens of members of this house who have the same complaint concerning the removal of unemployment insurance offices across the country, but it should be remembered that it was the hon. gentleman who is now the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia who was the creator of that policy, as a member of the government which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Brown) now supports. In view of the remarks the hon. member has made, it will be interesting to see how he votes when the motion of non-confidence is dealt with this evening.

We are approaching the anniversary of another 60 days, 60 days which some might compare with those famous but ill-conceived 60 days of a previous administration after it had been given the somewhat marginal confidence of the Canadian electorate in 1963. It is a vastly different 60 days, though, 60 days which seem to be titillating the timid, terrifying the bold and dazzling the daring with their footwork.

• (8:40 p.m.)

We have had a budget that has been produced by a Minister of Finance who makes his predecessor look like an expert. To contemplate the spectacle of the government's financial manipulations is to contemplate

chaos in command. They have now revealed their financial incompetence, their intellectual bankruptcy, and we have had the Prime Minister's proposal yesterday to cast the provinces aside in what will amount to a sea of debt.

For five years under successive Liberal administrations we have had plan after plan, program after program; wars on poverty which have been discontinued without a shot being fired. We have had the Canada Assistance Plan, the Canada Pension Plan, task force No. 1, task force Nos. 2 and 3, literally dozens of task forces travelling across the country to the extent, as I said before, we should be introducing a bill to unify all these task forces running around the country. Nothing has been achieved, except higher and higher costs, and higher and higher taxes, costs and taxes imposed by the government on the provinces because of the actions of the government.

**Mr. Groos:** And smaller oppositions.

**Mr. Nielsen:** But that situation won't prevail very long I can assure the hon. member. The people of this country can be fooled some of the time by some of the people, but not all of the time by people across the way.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Groos:** Author?

**Mr. Nielsen:** Well, it certainly wasn't the hon. gentleman. Medicare was a tragic example of social justice being sacrificed to political expediency. It was a field that was already occupied by the provinces. Ontario had a plan. Several provinces had signified their intention of setting up medicare. Saskatchewan was already in business, and Ottawa decided to break into the field, not for reasons of social equity, not for the general good of the greatest number of people in this country but for reasons of headline hunting political expediency, and there lies the truth of the medicare mess that the government finds itself in now.

That this was so, and is so, is shown by the formulation of the criteria which the provinces cannot meet and have made clear now they cannot meet, to say nothing of the two northern territories. I know there is not too much concern displayed on the opposite side of the house for the two northern territories because of lack of knowledge in connection with them. But here we have the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) saying that in five