

[Translation]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

Hon. Jacques Hébert: Honourable senators, I have the honour to present petitions signed by 517 citizens of Ontario who oppose the goods and services tax. These petitions come mainly from Hamilton, Brantford, Stoney Creek and Mississauga.

I also have the honour to present petitions signed by 504 citizens of Ontario who oppose the goods and services tax. These petitions come mainly from Cornwall, Alexandria, Scarborough, Owen Sound and Cambridge.

I also have the honour to present petitions signed by 500 citizens of Ontario who oppose the goods and services tax. These petitions come mainly from Mississauga and Oakville.

I also have the honour to present petitions signed by 500 citizens of Ontario who oppose the goods and services tax. These petitions come mainly from Sault Ste. Marie, Timmins, Kirkland Lake and Kapuskasing.

I also have the honour to present petitions signed by 500 citizens of Ontario who oppose the goods and services tax. These petitions come mainly from Mississauga, Oakville and Brantford.

I also have the honour to present petitions signed by 650 citizens of Ontario who oppose the goods and services tax. These petitions come mainly from Scarborough, Mississauga, Toronto, Ottawa, Welland and Guelph.

If I am not mistaken, the grand total is 3,171 petitioners who denounce the GST to a government that still refuses to listen to them.

● (0910)

[English]

ADJOURNMENT

Leave having been given to revert to Notices of Motions:

Hon. John Lynch-Staunton (Deputy Leader of the Government):

Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding rule 59(1)(h), I move:

That when the Senate adjourns today, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, 17th March, 1992, at two o'clock in the afternoon.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION PERIOD

[Senator Haidasz.]

THE BUDGET, 1992

RELATIONSHIP TO PAST BUDGETS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Royce Frith (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I have two items to deal with. The first is just to clarify a little *contretemps* that the Leader of the Government and I had about the previous budget. He quarrelled with some figures that I presented when questioning him in anticipation of Mr. Mazankowski's promised "realistic" budget.

Further to that, I want to clarify, because we have not had an answer to that question yet, that one of our disagreements was about Mr. Wilson's forecast in his last budget. Senator Murray expressed some scepticism about my numbers, so I want to clarify for him, when proceeding to get an answer to the question, that the figure is, as I stated, on page 94 of Mr. Wilson's budget of February 26, 1991. The forecast was, in fact, a deficit of \$24 billion for 92-93, and \$16.6 billion next year. So that is just a clarification.

Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I do not have the *Hansard* for the other day in front of me, but my honourable friend was speaking of this year and next year. This year is the fiscal year 1991-92 and next year is fiscal year 1992-93.

Senator Frith: I do not think that changes anything, because the difference that we had was over this budget forecast, and the burden of my question was that the forecasts had consistently been wrong. I picked that particular one as one example of a forecast that was wrong, and significantly wrong. The document I was referring to is the February 26, 1991, budget and the reference is on page 94.

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE

SOCIAL PROGRAMS—HISTORY OF DAYCARE LEGISLATION

Hon. Royce Frith (Leader of the Opposition): I want to ask the Leader of the Government about the government's daycare policy, and I have to make a short preamble to put it in context, because the question has to have a historical context to be sensible.

I go back to eight years ago, during the 1984 election campaign, when Mr. Mulroney referred to existing social programs as "sacred trusts". He considered future initiatives in the social sector and said the following about daycare—the quotation is from the *London Free Press*, August 11, 1984:

No longer can childcare be considered a luxury of the rich or a support program of the poor. It is an urgent problem for thousands of single parent families and a major concern in every family where both parents work. Urgency here is of paramount concern.

So eight years ago the matter was urgent.

Then in the fall of 1988, during what seemed to be a manoeuvre to kill his own daycare legislation, the Prime Minister again expressed concern:

We do not want Canadian women to go to work worried about their children and their children's wellbeing.