

bound to be revised as conditions, not only in Canada but in the world itself, change. When I gave the budget speech I thought I made it clear that all projections in the budget were at risk. I believe I made that statement in the budget speech. I think it is a reasonable one, and I assure the hon. member that I do not intend to feel apologetic if certain projections which have been laid out for 1981 or even earlier are not realized because of changing conditions. Projecting the economy is a risky business, and I find that economists are more often wrong than they are right.

**Mr. Rae:** So are Liberals.

**Mr. MacEachen:** That is no surprise to the hon. member, but I will tell him that if the basic conditions which are outlined in the budget change, then I would of course reconsider the posture which I adopted in the budget. However, I projected inflation and unemployment and I developed a fiscal program which I felt was the best possible one to deal with the situation this country will face over the next year.

**Mr. Rae:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for that answer and point out to him that on Thursday night people in Toronto were treated to a statement by his deputy minister with respect to the inflation problem. He cited a number of factors which meant that inflation was a worse and more severe problem than the department thought only four weeks ago. In light of this fact, the fact that the unemployment situation is clearly worse than projected even in the budget and that the government is prepared to accept an 8.7 per cent official rate of unemployment next year, which means 1.4 million or 1.5 million real unemployed people—which is important—I would like to ask the minister in what way he plans to change the government's policy since he indicated in his first answer that he does not hold to the projections. We are not talking about statistics in the sky. We are talking about whether real people will or will not have jobs next year and the prices real people will be paying for their food next year.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member has talked about inflation, which undoubtedly is a very serious problem, and the chances are that it will not abate in the near future. However, every proposal I have heard from him, from his leader and from every member of his party, if adopted, would add to the inflationary problem.

**Mr. Broadbent:** That is absurd.

**Mr. MacEachen:** It is absolutely the case that every proposal in the form of increased spending and in the form of instructions to the governor of the Bank of Canada to reduce interest rates, if adopted, would really show the country what inflation could be like under a New Democratic Party government.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

#### ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

##### PROPOSED WASTE DISPOSAL SITE AT SOUTH CAYUGA, ONT.

**Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk):** Madam Speaker, my question should be diverted to the Minister of the Environment. I will give him the benefit of the doubt and say that it appears he has sneaked out for coffee. Possibly the acting minister or the parliamentary secretary can answer my question.

I am sure the minister is aware of the action taken by the province of Ontario in establishing an industrial waste disposal site in South Cayuga, as pointed out in my motion under Standing Order 43, without holding an environmental hearing. I am equally sure the minister is aware that it will replace all 12 existing sites in Ontario, that it is on agricultural land and that it will require transportation of toxic wastes through the greatly populated agricultural heartland of Ontario.

Has the minister or his department taken or planned any action pertaining to this obvious denial of the individual's right to be heard?

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, in the absence of the minister, I shall refer to him the question asked by the hon. member at the earliest opportunity and ensure that the hon. member receives a full reply.

[English]

**Madam Speaker:** Does the hon. member wish to ask a supplementary question? I would not think so since the minister is not here.

**Mr. Bradley:** Yes, I do, Madam Speaker. I am sorry there is not someone opposite who could have given me some sort of answer.

I am sure the minister will know that this site rests between Lake Erie, a national waterway, and the Grand River, which is a major tributary to Lake Erie and is of national importance. This site is only one mile from the Grand River, Madam Speaker, and it is on a type of land that is shrinking only too quickly at this time.

● (1440)

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member please put the question. Supplementary questions must be kept fairly short.

**Mr. Bradley:** Would the minister please answer my supplementary question, since I see he has returned?

**An hon. Member:** Ask your question.

**Mr. Bradley:** Since a national waterway is involved at a site only 40 miles from Niagara Falls and the Love Canal and only 40 miles from the constituency of the hon. member for Hamil-