

try, we pick up taxes and investments in jobs, particularly in central Canada.

● (1730)

Speaking to that whole issue, because the real issue is jobs, could the Hon. Member give her Party's forecast on the loss of jobs? In November she will recall that her leader said we would lose 200,000 jobs as a result of the November 1984 Economic Statement, and she will recall the finance critic for her Party saying that we would lose 100,000 jobs as a result of the May Budget. She will also recall that the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) said we would lose 55,000 jobs as a result of the May Budget.

Can the Member give her forecast as to how many jobs this terrible Budget as she calls it will cost the country?

Miss Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member had two questions, the first one having to do with the effect of oil prices. I would agree with the Hon. Member in the long term, and I believe this is what the Economic Council said, that lower prices for oil stimulate our economy, with all the desirable results that he has mentioned. But in the short term, lower prices for oil will take away a lot of revenue from the Government on which the Government is counting in its Budget.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we are both right. The long-term results of a fall in oil prices are certainly desirable, but in the short term the Government's projection of reducing the deficit based on the figures quoted will not work.

About employment, many jobs were lost as a result of the November Budget. One has to look at the fact that even though new jobs are being created, an awful lot of jobs are being lost. In the Ontario manufacturing sector, for a start, there has been a very high job loss. Some of the new jobs being created are not jobs with the same quality.

For example, in one town heavily dependent upon the steel industry that I know of, hundreds of unionized steel workers who were fairly high earners, lost their jobs. Some have jobs now but they are at \$4 an hour. There is a lot of this kind of exchange going on and many part-time jobs are being created.

The other thing one has to remember is that the Statistics Canada method of recording the labour growth, admittedly the same way it is used internationally, does have some problems in it. Anybody who has worked for one hour in the last month is regarded as being in the labour force and employed. People who have not sought work in a certain period, I think it is also a month, are not counted as being in the labour force at all.

Until such time as the international way of keeping employment figures improves, there will be a lot of disguised unemployment, and these raw figures do not indicate the quality or the permanence of jobs. That is a factor that concerns us too.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I know how difficult it is to criticize a Budget like this which is so good, so fair and so equitable, but I was interested in the last remarks of the Hon.

The Budget—Miss Nicholson

Member when she said, in a blanket kind of way, that this Budget is one of tax, tax, tax and spend, spend, spend.

I would invite the Hon. Member for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) to look at the figures. She will see that the additional revenues being raised are quite modest considering the debt that has to be repaid, which debt was built up over the Liberal years of Government. There is something like \$1.5 billion in new revenues on a base of about \$70 billion with only a 2 per cent increase in taxes.

As for the spend, spend, spend part of her remarks, I would invite the Hon. Member to look at the figures. The annual increase in program expenditure growth over the last four or five years for the Government of which she was a supporter averaged between 10 per cent and 20 per cent. This Budget proposes no growth in program expenditures, no growth. In fact, on the non-statutory items a decrease in spending of about 2 per cent is forecast.

How can the Budget be described as tax, tax, tax, spend, spend, spend? Nothing could be further from the truth.

Miss Nicholson: By the Minister's own admission, taxes are rising by \$3.4 billion in the coming fiscal year, by \$5.2 billion in the year after that and by \$8 billion in the 1990 to 1991 fiscal year. There are the taxes.

As for the spending, I repeat, the Estimates tabled by the Government last year were record high. This year's Estimates have a 4 per cent increase on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions, comments? The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Vincent) resuming debate.

Mr. Pierre H. Vincent (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am always always pleased to rise in the House, especially to comment on the Budget which was tabled last week and on which I had the opportunity to work for over three months.

There is one thing that always amazes me when I listen to the speeches of Members of the Opposition: I look at the November 1984 economic statement, the May 1985 Budget and the February 26 Budget, and I realize that we have been hearing the same speeches three times in a row.

Among other things, they do not even mention the 580,000 jobs created over the past year and a half. Not a word about the fact that for the first time in Canada's history 129,000 new jobs were created in January 1986. They do not say anything about that, Mr. Speaker.

And yet we can still recall their speeches of November 1984 and May 1985 about a bad economic statement and a bad Budget. Well, had the economic statement and the May 1985 Budget been as bad as all that, there is no way we could have created 129,000 jobs in a single month, in January of this year. It was an unprecedented achievement in Canada. Mr. Speaker,