

I could quote many examples in the health area, Mr. Speaker, where no planning was made on the Quebec side. Never. It was done in a haphazard manner and today one can hear: People go and "see a doctor" in Ontario. People do not go and "see a doctor" in Ontario, Mr. Speaker. They do not have any other alternative because, as I said earlier, they have always been forgotten. The federal government pays 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[English]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when I was a new member in the House of Commons one of the old timers in the House was talking to a bunch of us young fellows and said, "I want to give you a bit of advice. Don't mail your mail, if it is a nasty letter, until the morning. Think it through and wait until morning, because perhaps your initial reaction might not be the one that governs your behaviour eventually". That kind of attitude might well have been adopted by the leader of the New Democratic Party and his colleagues last Monday evening, and especially before Friday when the leader of the New Democratic Party took part in this debate.

One thing I have noticed from watching this debate in the last few days is the change in attitude, not on the part of hon. members on this side of the House but on the part of those on the other side. Consistently throughout the speeches that we have heard in the last three or four days hon. members on that side of the House have been on the defensive. We are now one week from the glamour budget of last Monday night, and many on that side of the House have voiced different ideas. I think that within the next several months this attitude will not only be felt across the way but throughout the whole country.

I want to touch on a little bit of history. My colleague from Provencher (Mr. Epp) has touched on the fact that Canada is a difficult country to govern. He said that we are a rather unique country. We are the second largest in the world, have very few people, who are dispersed across a large land, and we are situated next to the most powerful nation in the world. We are a country that depends heavily on exports, a country that is made up of many regions with regional differences and difficulties. Those who have held the reins of office in this country since 1867, when confederation was born, have come to recognize that Canada is a difficult country to govern. It is also an exciting country to govern, a country that provides a great challenge to its parliamentarians.

In 1968 even the members of the opposition came to this House of Commons with a little bit of the excitement that many Canadians felt regarding the leadership they expected to be provided by the then brand new Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who had literally swept Canadians off their feet. It was not much more than one year later that the members of this party received what I consider was a profound shock when they started to hear of the economic revelations of the Prime Minister.

I am not an economist, Mr. Speaker. I have had no connection with economics and I doubt whether I could

The Budget—Mr. Lundrigan

even spell the word. However, I know that if you want to help people who are on fixed or low incomes, people who are seasonally employed, those who are among the most disadvantaged in the nation, you do not help them by putting them out of work. Yet the Prime Minister stated that we must adopt an economic model to take care of inflation. He said that if we are to protect people who make only \$2,000 a year, or those who are on fixed incomes, or those who are only employed for five or six months a year—the little people of Canada—we must control inflation. The method that he used to control that inflation was to put these people out of work. If political parties could collectively be held responsible for certain acts under the Criminal Code, then I suggest there would certainly be a place for the Prime Minister and his cabinet.

I should like to say something to the few NDP members who are present tonight. There is one difference between what the Prime Minister did and other disasters that have overtaken us. Everyone knows that a plague, a war or pestilence either destroys or disadvantageously affects the economy of a country, but such a thing is usually accepted for what it is since it is beyond our means to control. The difference between that kind of situation and the attitude of the Prime Minister is that the Prime Minister decided deliberately that this was the model which had to be accepted in order to cure inflation in the country. The evidence of this is in the fact that since 1967—I will give the statistics a little later to prove this—we have had approximately a 50 per cent increase in unemployment across the nation.

• (2110)

During three years, members of this party have constantly during budget debates, question periods and speeches in the House taken issue with the policies of the government—but there has been no moving this Prime Minister during these years; he has been so carried away by his own omnipotence. The Canadian people, labour unions, consumers groups, provinces, municipalities and various provincial premiers, such as the NDP premier of Manitoba, have been criticized because they suggested there was an unemployment problem. In any event, nobody could budge the Prime Minister. We all know his attitude and how it became manifested.

It is unfortunate that during the past three or four years someone has not got inside the House with a camera in order that the people of Canada might see what was happening. Had that been the case, I am sure we would have 200 seats here now. The people would then know of the Prime Minister's reaction, perhaps unwittingly, to the Lapalme workers and to members of this House on the occasion when he used the expression "fuddle-duddle". Canadians would then know the attitude adopted by this unbudging Prime Minister, and I am sure it would have had an adverse effect for him in the results of the last election. In any event, the Prime Minister cannot be budged.

Last year, instead of the inflation-unemployment trade-off we had the Benson-Turner trade-off. Last February we had the Benson trade-off with Turner and everybody got the feeling that we were going to have someone new from the east, but it turned out to be someone new from