

The problem is that people cannot buy the groceries that the hon. member was talking about. To buy \$7,000 worth of groceries, they need to have \$14,000 earned because of the level of taxation from each level of government.

Taxes are the problem. Will the member admit that it is government overspending and government overborrowing that is the problem? That is what creates the high taxes. Will he admit that the budget is a fraud, should be scrapped and replaced with a real plan to get control of spending, to reduce taxes and to create jobs?

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, on the member's suggestion about the fiscal monitor, if he wants to bring in a motion that will call for a simplified fiscal monitor, I will second the resolution for him. I am with him on that issue.

However, listening to the last bit of juicy stuff toward the end, he lunched too long today. The subsidized food is getting to him. He talks about a fraud and this kind of thing. Does he not understand or have enough charity to accept that even if people on this side of the House did not do exactly what he would want us to do at least we have the goodwill to do our best?

To suggest it is fraudulent is an insult to well intended members of this House. I do not think he meant that for a second. It was one of those throw away phrases in the heat of debate which he regrets already. I can tell by the remorse on his face.

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised that the Liberal member who just spoke ignored the concerns of the opposition parties regarding the deficit, because to the Liberals, deficits are part of their culture. In fact, they invented them. Our big deficits started with Mr. Turner in 1972, 1974 and 1975, and in 1981, when the Liberals forecast a \$16 billion deficit, they waited for 16 months before bringing down a budget and then produced a deficit of \$38 billion by the end of 1983. So it is perfectly normal for the Liberal member who is part of this Liberal culture and who has been sitting as a Liberal for a long time to be unconcerned about deficits. To them, deficits were never something to worry about. It was just too much trouble.

• (1620)

I also wish to tell him that in my riding, after the budget was brought down, a budget that attacked the unemployed instead of employment, the unemployed in my riding were asking: What is the difference between a Liberal member and the unemployed? And the answer was: the unemployed used to work.

And we could also say, when we hear the Minister of Finance bring down a budget like this, that in my riding—and you come from a nice part of Eastern Canada where there are wonderful oysters, well, we found a new way to open them, and I was

Supply

talking to people from Eastern Canada who came down to demonstrate in front of Saint-Jean—just a minute Mr. Speaker, I am finishing my sentence—against the closing of the military college, and they said this—Mr. Speaker, I would like to finish so that my colleague will have a chance to respond.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I believe he has clearly understood the question. The hon. member for Burin—St. George's.

[English]

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, as always I thank my friend from Richelieu for his spirited participation in the debate. I am in English for two reasons. My French is lousy and I want to reach for a metaphor that I cannot translate yet.

We in Newfoundland talk about the pot calling the kettle black. I seem to remember that there used to be a person with the same surname representing the same riding of Richelieu who sat in this House for the Tory Party between 1984 and 1990. As a matter of fact he had somewhat the same features as the gentleman who just spoke. If I may just—

The Deputy Speaker: The time has expired. Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Leroux (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, we have almost reached the end of the period provided under the Standing Orders for debate on the opposition motion presented by the hon. member for the Reform Party, concerning the Budget Plan for 1994.

I think the motion presented by the Reform Party is only a partial response to the expectations and policies I am about to explain, regarding the budget, job creation and cuts in public spending.

As you know, Canada's economy is the worst among G-7 countries. Recession, deficit and unemployment have become household words, unfortunately! Canada's monetary policy, although aimed at controlling inflation, merely exacerbates endemic unemployment in this country. Lacklustre job creation and the deterioration of Canada's public finances are largely responsible for the lack of vigour of our economy. It is not a pretty picture.

This lack of economic growth which has affected Canada for many years has led to some very serious consequences for Canada and Quebec. This lack of economic growth was followed by budgetary irresponsibility in federal public finances. At first, the Canadian government borrowed to finance existing and new programs. Subsequently, it had to borrow to pay the interest on previous loans, and now we are caught up in this debt cycle. Interest payments on the national debt have absorbed an increasingly larger proportion of government revenues. That is where we are now.