

### Supply

tion only criticizes. It is easy to criticize, but if you have ideas, let us know and tell us about them. We suggested a short-term action plan in January 1992, ten months ago, with a very vital component. I am referring to an infrastructure program that would have made it possible to kick-start the economy and put Canadians and especially the people of Montreal back to work, because in Montreal construction has always been the bell wether industry. It always took the lead and the rest followed. The construction industry was always there to kick-start the economy and had, in the process, created thousands of jobs, and we had projects that enhanced the environment and the quality of life in our region and our city.

Let us look at the situation in Montreal. In October 1991 Montreal had an unemployment rate of 11.5 per cent or 186,000 people out of work. Today, a year later, the rate is 12.8 per cent or 204,000 people without work.

In the construction industry alone, the engine, a key economic sector, the unemployment rate is nearly 50 per cent. I am not the one saying that. It is the Quebec construction industry commission, the organization that manages all the regulations of the Quebec construction industry for both employees and management. Poverty in Montreal: a little over 615,000 people or 21.5 per cent of the total population of the metropolitan area live in poor households. More than 70 per cent of these poor people live on the island of Montreal and 50 per cent in the city of Montreal itself. In the city of Montreal, which has a million inhabitants, one family in four and one out of two single people are on low income. That is the sad situation of Montreal.

In Montreal alone the food banks distribute 12 tonnes of food a day, enough to fill the Olympic Stadium field to a height of eight feet ten times a year. I am not the one saying that. It was in *Le Soleil* on March 25, 1992.

Half the adults in Montreal do not work, according to an unpublished document of the Quebec Department of Labour and Income Security. I am not the one saying that; it was in *La Presse* on February 29, 1992.

The employment level in the cities of Montreal and Laval is 54.6 per cent. A dynamic city usually has an

employment level of around 70 per cent outside recession periods.

That is the picture of Montreal. That in broad strokes is how the newspapers describe Montreal.

The occupancy rate for office buildings is lower in Montreal than in the rest of Canada. That was in *Le Devoir* on November 10, 1992. *La Presse* of November 10, 1992 reports that home building dropped 11 per cent in October. An 11 per cent drop in just one month. How does one revive the economy when the government tries to tell us that things are moving now and starting to go well?

Poverty among families and children is getting worse in Canada, according to the Campaign 2000 report.

People pay \$1,900 more in taxes under the Conservatives. Middle income families have borne the brunt of tax increases since 1984, according to one study. This is not just what opposition critics say; the figures and studies are there.

Despite all that, in addition to raising taxes, the government has also increased all service costs. The other day I had a sickening experience. In my riding office I received an old man who wanted to bring his nephew to Canada because he was old and needed some family member near him. He was told by the immigration bureau that he first had to pay \$450 for a sponsorship application, although this service was free before.

We could talk about taxes and charges for immigration, citizenship and passports. If you want a small booklet or folder from the Federal Business Development Bank you have to pay for it.

Despite all that, again this morning, the \$34.6 billion federal deficit exceeds the government's objectives, since the minister in his last budget told us that it would be about \$27 billion. The deficit is now \$35 billion, in spite of all the tax increases.

I see that my time is nearly up.

• (1320)

It is clear. My colleague had to move a motion because it will be four years tomorrow. Since this government was elected and it is now time to have an election so that