

*Oral Questions*

The medical community has sufficient knowledge to realize that drugs given for pain are effective only if given regularly rather than intermittently. Currently there are excellent drugs available for this purpose other than heroin. Heroin is a potent respiratory depressant, a phenomenon which has led many medical practitioners to discontinue its use before any Government intervention.

I am concerned that columnist power instead of good judgment is being used to extract money from Canadian citizens, money that could more effectively be used in other fields of medical research than returning to the use of heroin even in a limited way.

\* \* \*

**THE BUDGET**

## MINISTER'S DESCRIPTION OF MEDIA BEHAVIOUR

**Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster):** Madam Speaker, when is a peep a leak, and when is a leak a theft? The Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) told reporters yesterday, and I quote:

I would rather call it a theft than a leak, or a peep than a leak, if you wish.

Just to confuse matters more, the Minister then tried, through his press secretary, to put pressure on a reporter from Newsradio to withdraw the offending phrase. This was followed by intimidation, threats, and a bribe to the reporter by offering a further seven-minute interview with the Minister of Finance.

Is there no end to the Minister's largesse? The reporter was offered more interview time with the Minister if he would only remove the offending word "theft". Truly it can be said of this Minister: "Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practise to deceive."

It is one thing for the Minister to add \$200 million to our already crippling debt load, but it seems to me that he is adding insult to injury by blaming it all on the media and then going so far as to accuse them of theft.

We are now in a situation, Madam Speaker, where reporters invited into the Minister's office for a pre-budget photo opportunity session are accused of theft for simply doing what they are invited to do in the first place—take photos of the Minister holding up his budget. This photo session cost the people of Canada \$200 million in additional debt over two years, which at present interest rates costs \$1 million a month.

\* \* \*

**THE BUDGET**

## CALL FOR REVIEW OF BUDGETARY PRACTICE

**Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I want to follow up on the statement just made by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). The evidence that the House and the country have heard over the

last few days with respect to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) is a good indication of the Peter Principle at work: when things can go wrong, they will. The Minister of Finance has added a new wrinkle: when things could be worse, they will be worse. Yesterday he compounded his difficulties.

● (1115)

In some of the statements he has made he talked about the necessity of opening the budgetary practice. I think the House of Commons ought to consider it a necessity to review the budgetary practice. If there is no case to be made in some areas for secrecy, then secrecy should be removed. We ought not to have these monumental intrusions on good sense and logic compounded by deception. Murphy's law, the Peter Principle, or whatever applies—this is a mess that is now in the hands of this House of Commons to clean up.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**THE BUDGET**

## FULL EMPLOYMENT—LEVEL FORECAST BY GOVERNMENT

**Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Yesterday the Minister of Finance stated that 7 or 8 per cent of the work force would remain unemployed even if the economy were running full speed ahead. That pretty well confirms the projections contained in the Minister's budget that when we are supposed to be three or four years into recovery, for example in 1987, we will have an unemployment rate of 8.8 per cent, or 1.162 million Canadians unemployed. Were these personal musings of the Minister of Finance, or does the Government now accept 7 or 8 per cent to be full employment in this country?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the Government has views about the current situation and it has proposed a budget to deal with the situation. What happens seven or eight years down the road is a matter for pretty general conjecture. If I am Prime Minister at that time I will certainly undertake to express my views on that before the time arises.

**Mr. McGrath:** Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister has just confirmed what he said this morning, that he was leaving it to others to worry about unemployment five or ten years down the road. We are talking about projections of the Government based on its own strategy for economic recovery. I would remind the Prime Minister that in December, 1979, when this Party was in office and unemployment stood at 7.2 per cent and was projected to reach 8.2 per cent, as reported at page 2297 of *Hansard* the President of the Treasury Board said that our proposal showed: