

other things that we have to do to make the title correspond to other acts of Parliament.

I ask Senator Marshall to consider withdrawing the bill. It may be that some people will have an emotional reaction to being labelled a war veteran. Will the cost to the government of doing this not be beyond the benefit to be achieved?

• (1540)

Perhaps Senator Marshall might reconsider the situation, and talk to those who are urging that this be done. I am not quite sure who is urging this course of action. Is there a demand here from the Merchant Navy coalition? Are they supporting this? Who exactly is supporting it? Perhaps they will reconsider the matter and agree that, as Canadians, we have accepted all along that when we talk about veterans we are talking about war veterans. There should not be an attempt to classify one group of veterans as being different from another group of veterans.

I know what Senator Marshall has been able to accomplish for the Merchant Navy veterans. Indeed, at the moment a new book is being prepared for the Peace Tower recognizing the Merchant Navy. That is thanks to his efforts. Have we not really done what is required here by that recognition, which was a long time coming, admittedly. However, now that we are proceeding with it, is that not sufficient recognition? Why is it necessary for the government to incur the costs involved in changing a great number of statutes simply to insert one word? That exercise will not really benefit those veterans in any way.

**Hon. Jack Marshall:** Honourable senators, despite the very kind words of Senator Molgat, he read out an interpretation of what the result would be if the word "war" was inserted in the Merchant Navy veterans legislation. I quarrel with that suggestion, which must have come from the Department of Veterans Affairs, as I quarrel with many of the things that the Department of Veterans Affairs does.

In the meantime, I will adjourn the debate.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I had been informed to advise you that if Senator Marshall spoke, his speech would close the debate. However, I did not do so because I felt that he was responding to Senator Molgat's intervention. I may have been out of order, but at least my intentions were good.

Now Senator Marshall wishes to move that this debate be adjourned.

**Senator Molgat:** Might it be advisable for some other senator to take the adjournment rather than Senator Marshall? It would then leave the matter open.

On motion of Senator Berntson, debate adjourned.

[ Senator Molgat ]

[Translation]

## THE BUDGET

### STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Phillips, calling the attention of the Senate to the Budget Statement made by the Minister of Finance, on Tuesday, February 22, 1994.—(*Honourable Senator Berntson.*)

**Hon. Jean-Maurice Simard:** Honourable senators, the first budget of Jean Chrétien's Liberal government was supposed to reflect the Red Book of the Liberal Party of Canada and restore hope to unemployed Canadians, ensure that the economic growth initiated by the previous government would continue and, finally, reduce the deficit.

However, that is not the case. Workers and the unemployed have been severely affected by this budget, and the elderly as well. For the Atlantic provinces, the budget is a real disaster. Because of the number of unemployed in those provinces, the budget comes down even harder.

On top of all that, the Liberal budget provides for the closing of five military bases and reducing the strength of two other bases in Atlantic Canada. Closings and strength reductions represent a loss of several thousand jobs in the Atlantic region. A five per cent cut in the budget for ACOA represents a loss of \$16 million and will be felt particularly in northern New Brunswick, a region that did not really need more bad news of this kind.

The reduction in Special Investment Tax Credits is another disaster for the Atlantic provinces, and I am not exaggerating, because this particular measure will be very costly for northern New Brunswick and the whole Atlantic region.

In fact, the New Brunswick Deputy Minister for Economic Development, Mr. Lauzier, indicated recently that \$225 million worth of investment will be lost to northern New Brunswick alone. Where the PC spent an average of \$500 million annually on the groundfish program, the present budget has set up a five-year program that will spend an average of \$340 million.

We cannot remain uncritical of a budget whose impact is so negative and so disastrous for our regions and our fellow citizens. As far as integrity is concerned, with this budget Jean Chrétien's Liberals have done the exact opposite of what they promised before last October.

Despite all these budget cuts, despite substantial tax hikes at the expense of the unemployed, the elderly and small business, Mr. Martin expects a drop of one-tenth of one per cent in the unemployment rate for next year. What a spark of hope for the unemployed! If only the government had been able to gain the confidence of financial markets and international markets with these measures — but that was not the case!