

*Government Orders*

If I am not mistaken, there was a deficit of \$45 billion and a debt of \$550 billion, and I believe he would make things worse. If I misunderstood, I am waiting to be corrected.

• (1705)

The second thing he mentioned that I object to are user fees. I never heard anyone on this side of the House mention such a thing. Why scare people? Why does he pretend that we are studying the matter? In fact, the Minister of Health has said repeatedly "no user fees", so why does he make such a comment? Does he not feel that it is unjust, cruel, maybe a bit dishonest?

**Mr. Guimond:** Mr. Speaker, listening to the hon. member for St. Boniface, I am pleased to learn that we are allowed to accuse one another of making dishonest comments. I wonder if the hon. member heard the first part of my speech. I think he may have come in partway through. I will nonetheless answer his two belated questions.

First, what we blame the present Liberal government for is that in its February 22 budget it came up with nothing more than a national infrastructure program which will cost \$2 billion in federal taxes, \$2 billion in provincial taxes and \$2 billion in municipal taxes, after running its campaign on a platform of jobs, jobs, jobs. This program will create 45,000 jobs per year, but just temporary ones. When Metropolitan Boulevard in Montreal and Saint-Jean Street in Quebec City have been upgraded, and the sidewalks redone, what other structural projects will there be to create permanent employment?

We, in the Bloc Québécois, have suggested innovative job creation projects. A project like the high speed train would create 120,000 work-years of employment for the duration of the construction phase as well as 40,000 permanent jobs to operate the Quebec-Windsor corridor. It would also be possible to export Bombardier technology under North American licence for use in ten upcoming HST projects. Two hundred billion in investments over the next 12 years, that is what infrastructure programs, programs that create permanent jobs and high-tech jobs are about. That is my position with regard to the national debt and the deficit.

I will also remind the hon. member for St. Boniface that, had Quebec said yes in the 1980 referendum, the accumulated federal deficit was \$75 billion at the time, compared to over \$500 billion today. At this rate, what we are going to tell the people of Quebec next time around is that we can no longer afford to remain part of this country; we must get out because it is headed for a \$600-billion or \$700-billion deficit. That will be one of the arguments in the next referendum campaign.

As for deterrent fees, it is true that, since January 17, I have never heard the Minister of Health, or anyone else for that matter, say there would be any. I must admit that is true. Yet,

with regard to the provinces' finances, the danger is that all of them end up facing cash flow difficulties and that the have-not provinces can no longer afford providing health care services because of cuts in federal transfer payments.

In Quebec, we are facing a real danger of finding ourselves back, like in the 1950s, with two types of medical practices: one for the rich and another one for the poor. With sickness striking without distinction of social status, race, language, and so on, there is a danger that the only way some Quebecers will be able to afford treatment will be to mortgage their home and belongings or to sell everything. That is the danger. It is true that the federal government never talked about imposing deterrent fees, but it does put the provinces in a situation where they could well experience cash flow and public finance problems that may divide people into two classes for health care.

[English]

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of the hon. member of the Bloc. He talked about ways to create permanent jobs.

• (1710)

I have a question for him. He mentioned three particular projects: the TGV high speed rail line, the Quebec to Windsor corridor and the exporting of Bombardier technology to different parts of the world.

As I am sure most economists and the Bloc will acknowledge, real permanent jobs must come from the private sector. Although the current government disagrees with the Reform position on how to create real jobs and pushes ahead with credit card infrastructure programs to create temporary jobs, does the Bloc agree that the source of real permanent jobs is from the private sector? If so, is the hon. member talking about total private sector investment in the three particular megaprojects he has suggested? Or, is this another request for more government subsidies and more government money to be poured into the province of Quebec?

I find absolutely incredible that day after day we come to the House and hear the Bloc party talking about wanting to leave our country, wanting to separate. Yet day after day the Bloc sits in the House and continually asks for more money. Indeed this is a contrast in thought.

I want to ask the hon. member about these three projects. Is he simply looking for more government money to be poured into Quebec? I noticed this morning the Liberal government authorized some \$575,000 going to the Montreal Symphony Orchestra and the Quebec Ballet going on a European tour. Earlier I talked about not having any food in the cupboard and buying a television set. This is just another case of money going into the province of Quebec that we just do not have.