

Government Orders

improves, better tailors those programs for a new time, not an excuse for gutting those programs.

There are people in need. There are people who depend on those programs. That is why I am proud to live in Canada. We were told this week once again that we live by internationally accepted criteria in the best country in the world. That comes as no surprise to us; even those who are working hard to leave the country must grudgingly acknowledge that.

The budget addresses all three of those important elements or areas. There are initiatives to create jobs, including the \$6 billion shared cost infrastructure program which is now well under way. In so far as Newfoundland is concerned, the first phase was announced a month or so ago. The second phase will be announced tomorrow, a number of other projects that will help stimulate the economy and some short and medium term job creation.

The budget also contains important support for technological innovation and for the small business sector, a subject dear to the heart of my good friend from Broadview—Greenwood.

There is also important action in this bill, in this budget, to reduce the deficit primarily through cuts in government spending. Gross fiscal savings including the savings announced in previous budget secured by this legislation total \$28.6 billion over the next three fiscal years. Net savings in that period total \$20.4 billion. These measures will help to shrink the deficit from \$45.7 billion in the year just ending to \$39.7 billion in 1994-95, and to \$32.7 billion the year after; \$13 billion savings in two years.

I say to my good friend from Yellowhead, whom I am always delighted to see in this Chamber, it is important that the choice is not seen as being between jobs and the deficit. It is not one or the other. We would be irresponsible as parliamentarians if we saw it as one or the other, as if we said put the whole job need on hold for five years until we get the deficit under control, or put the deficit issue under control for five years until we get the job situation properly addressed. It is not that simple. Life does not stand still for people who have to buy the groceries, nor does life stand still in terms of accruing interest on our indebtedness as a country.

We have to juggle those two very difficult balls at one time. That is the challenge. The country is full of experts there who will tell you how to create jobs, who will tell you how to reduce the deficit. The crunch comes when you ask them to hold both balls in the air at the same time. Whatever the rhetoric of various members in this House, including mine, I do not believe there is a single soul in this chamber who believes that we can put one of those issues on hold while we solve the other. That would be

irresponsible and I do not think Canadians sent us here to be irresponsible.

• (1310)

The measures announced in this budget last February will, of course, be supplemented with further initiatives next year as we reform major spending programs. We are taking some action now and will take some more in the future to ensure the deficit continues to decline steeply.

The budget also takes some measures to provide stable, sustainable funding for Canada's social safety net. This funding will provide a secure and constructive environment for both individual Canadians and policy makers at all levels of government as we embark on the process of reform and renewal that is currently under way. This legislation, Bill C-17, addresses two areas of spending in this regard: transfers to the provinces and changes to the UI program. I want to spend a moment on each of those.

First, the matter of unemployment insurance, a matter that is dear to my heart because it is dear to the hearts of my constituents who, through no fault of their own, have gone through the following traumatic situation in the last few years.

I say to my friend from Okanagan—Shuswap that when I first came here in November, 1979 my riding had a rate of unemployment which was the same as that in Alberta, the province of my friend from Yellowhead. It was 3.8 per cent in November, 1979. The riding of Burin—St. George's with its deep sea and inshore year round fishery, unaffected by ice conditions which have an impact on other parts of the island of Newfoundland, has always had a basic 11.5 month fishery, never a 12 month fishery. We believe strongly in certain things in Newfoundland and one of the things we believe in is the 12 days of Christmas. We take that time off for a great celebration of a great Christian festival and for a great party. In Newfoundland these two issues are not mutually exclusive.

It is an 11.5 month fishery. It never was a 12 month fishery. I would oppose it from ever becoming a 12 month fishery for the above reasons. It has degenerated, through no fault of the hard working people whose ancestors came to that coast 500 years ago. It is certainly not laziness or what we call in Newfoundland being a hangashore, one who stays ashore rather than go fishing. We have a very provocative and descriptive term for a lazy person in Newfoundland; he or she is called a hangashore and by definition that is somebody who will not go fishing. In Newfoundland work is fish, basically. That is why 17,000 people in my riding, until the recent catastrophes in the fishery, have traditionally earned their living either in the fishing boat or in the fish plant.

I was saying to my friends from Alberta and British Columbia across the aisle that in 1979 the rate of unemployment in my