EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there were two parts to the economic plan outlined in the red book. The first was to get our finances under control and the second was to stimulate job creation.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. We have been bold in setting targets for reducing the deficit to 3 per cent of GDP. Why is there no target for a reduction in the level of unemployment?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member does not ask easy questions.

Canada, like many other countries, is undergoing a fundamental revolution in the job market. That is why the government is acting as it is with its reforms in employability by HRD, in research and development, in industry. It is why the access to capital for small business is so important.

All of these are in the area where one sets the climate for the private sector. Therefore the questions that arise are: Should government be setting targets in areas where it does not have at least as much control as it should over the public finances? What about the kinds of jobs, part time or full time? What about the problem of the working poor, which is almost as important? These are questions I believe have to be addressed within the context of the member's question.

The real answer is that no level of unemployment is acceptable.

* *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I wish to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of Baroness Brigstocke, the Conservative whip of the House of Lords of Britain.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages and

Routine Proceedings

pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), the government's response to four petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INDUSTRY

Mr. Paul Zed (Fundy—Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 81(4), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Industry concerning the order of reference dated Tuesday, February 28, 1995 relating to the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1996.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons.

The committee has considered vote 15 under justice in the main estimates ending the fiscal year March 31, 1996 and now reports the same.

FINANCE

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 17th report of the Standing Committee of Finance on votes 1, 5 and 10 under national revenue in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1996.

May I thank the members from all parties for their splendid co-operation and constructive suggestions in our report.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During the examination of the estimates of the Department of National Revenue, I pointed out department estimates on vote 1 were about \$10 million higher than the amount specified in the federal budget submitted in February.

The transcript will show the motion that: "We approve the estimates in principle, reconciling them with the budget" was passed unanimously. The motion to reconcile was ruled out of order and is not reflected in the minutes being tabled today.

Because the department estimates of all departments are printed before the finance minister presents his budget, we have noted there will be discrepancies between ministry estimates and the finance minister's dollar allocation to these ministries.

The solution might include Your Honour recommending to the Minister of National Revenue that he submit a reconciliation, as unanimously requested by committee members. If this was taken as precedent, your ruling would take a giant step to putting the members in charge of expenditures of taxpayers' dollars.