

future about which they had thought over the 17 years. They gave that precious gift they bore us the other night the title of "Achieve Our Potential Budget".

What is the vision they offered to us? As far as I can discern, in their desire to put it all out and to let it all hang out for the next four or five years on the records they are offering to this country, which already has too high an unemployment rate, a consistent, continuing and even higher unemployment rate.

**An hon. Member:** Lower than yours.

**Mr. Andras:** Oh, is that the case? Is that right? Let us just examine that for a moment. The projection of the Conservative government is to see unemployment, and they are aiming for it, at a rate of 8.3 per cent next year. What has been so far only the occasional monthly high around that figure they have now set out as a projection, their target, which becomes the norm lasting for the next two years. After that—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Andras:** You can take your medicine now so things will improve later. The best thing you can look at in their five-year projection is that at the end of the five years, and for the last three years of that period, they are accepting 7.5 per cent unemployment as their target.

We have inflation on the one hand and unemployment on the other hand. One looks from that, having been disappointed, about unemployment, to what this great new plan of theirs is going to do for the cost of living and inflation. What do they promise us? Next year they promise 11 per cent and the following year 10.1 per cent. That is, of course, in the low range. Do not look at the high range of their forecast which is probably more likely to be the realization. Eventually, after five years, in 1983 or 1984, they say we are going to get down to 6 per cent, if you can believe them. Frankly, I say that anybody who would accept that kind of a forecast five years ahead, in the face of the international shocks that we face from time to time, is really very naive.

This new face and new vision of Canada, this new version of how to run the economy that they have promised to our confederation, has turned out to be a death mask. It is a face of a government obviously with a death wish, because I do not think the people of this country or the members of this House can very long permit the survival of a regime which can offer as its most optimistic scenario for the next five years a fate for this country that is worse than anything we have experienced in the recent past or, indeed, as bad as anything we have experienced in this country since the 1930s. That is their own projection. That is what they say when they set it all out there in all these documents that reveal their program for the future. They do not even keep it a secret. It is all in there and it is manifest in every page of the budget when you read it, Mr. Speaker. In fact, they are even increasing taxes on some cosmetics, risking probably the only chance they had to disguise the revised face of this grim Conservative party with its grim Conservative pessimism that they term reality.

### *The Budget—Mr. Andras*

Those dismal figures I have quoted from their own documents, the summary of the budget papers, are not really surprising when one looks at the economic doctrine and the techniques that they intend to employ in trying to improve this country's economy. They have two key hinges on which their policy hangs; one is to get the deficit down, with a long-term reduction in the federal deficit, and the other is the so-called energy self-sufficiency policy.

● (1640)

The government has been crying about how they will get the federal cash deficit down. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Stevens) is going around slashing, cutting, shouting, making speeches, but he accepts the projection made the other night that continuing increases in government expenditures will be higher than each of the last three years, a 10 per cent annual increase.

**An hon. Member:** But a lower deficit.

**Mr. Andras:** I am very glad the hon. member brought that up because I am going to come to that subject and indicate how it will be accomplished by this new government. The President of the Treasury Board accepts government expenditures increasing from \$48 billion last year to \$78 billion at the end of this five-year projection, a 60 per cent increase. This is the government's dramatic new policy while interest charges rise from about \$7 billion a year to about \$14 billion a year with higher inflation and unemployment, and real growth expected, even in the wildest of expectations, to be no higher than 3 per cent.

**An hon. Member:** It is all on your shoulders.

**Mr. Andras:** Listen to all this nonsense. On Tuesday night the Conservative party finally cut the umbilical cord and is off and flying—or not flying, but crashing on their own. Most of the press people in this country give them no more than seven months to whirl around saying, "What a tough job we have because of the previous government". From this point on the figures will be their figures. This plan is their plan and the plan which contains these projections to which I have referred.

**An hon. Member:** It will get the cash deficit down.

**Mr. Andras:** I am glad that the hon. gentleman brought that up.

**Mr. Friesen:** You cooked them often enough.

**Mr. Andras:** I am merely referring to the material, or the ammunition, which the government gave us the other night. The Conservative party has boasted that they would reduce the deficit from \$10 billion to \$4 billion. Their expenditures will go up \$30 billion and their tax increases will go up by over \$3 billion a year. But yet they still end up with a budgetary deficit of \$9 billion.

Do hon. members know that the cash deficit reduction will come from an accidental accrual of pension funds which has