

*Supply*

and two are four, and four and four are eight. I am convinced several members on this side are already aware of those mathematics.

But the Minister of State for Finance did not tell us that with projections over a five-year period, because that is what we are given here, projections over two, three or five years—the Minister of State seems to have forgotten it. We will remember that the last two or three ministers of finance, including the one I see before me and this will not be the first time we have been given projections that prove wrong later on, and not only false but so far from reality that they border on scandal, on hypocrisy; they even smack of lies. Of course, I am not accusing anyone of having lied to us deliberately. They did not know what they were saying: May God forgive them! But obviously we are dealing here with false projections. We are constantly told about the hundreds, the thousands of jobs that have been created right and left. But I say to you that in 1968—I believe we came to this House at the same time—there were 300,000 unemployed, while there are now a million of them. It is a fact that over the last six months 235,000 jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector, and 100,000 others will be lost according to the projections made by a very responsible association. I ask this government to come up with something positive, an emergency plan. Of course, they will ask whether we want the deficit to be reduced, inflation to be wrestled down. For the past ten years I have been hearing about wrestling down inflation. Unemployment is created to fight inflation, and inflation is created to fight unemployment. We are having both anyway.

**Mr. Guilbault:** Read your sentence in *Hansard* tomorrow.

**Mr. La Salle:** I submit we have both. Do we not? Of course, we do. And this is the result of projections as brilliant as those the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault) should have made, but I am not aware he has made any for quite some time. Today we heard the Minister of Finance. I think we are in a serious predicament, a catastrophic one. There will be 100,000 jobs lost and the government gives us nothing. There is nothing in the budget to ensure that in the short term our economy will be redirected and strengthened. The Minister of Finance confirmed this yesterday in Toronto. Such proposals will result in increased unemployment, to wrestle down the inflation we never could control these last ten years. Can we afford in Quebec to lose 100,000 jobs at this point? Should we not reassess our priorities and make political choices based on our moral and political responsibilities? On the humane level, Mr. Speaker, we have a hard-hearted government. It is willing to add to the misery of those who already are suffering and to add thousands worse to their numbers. This is unbelievable and unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. All categories are affected: farmers are unhappy, businessmen are dissatisfied, workers are penalized, the young are worried, and rightly so. And these people across the aisle are asking us to trust them. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of State

for Finance would have us believe there is a solution in the budget. Nothing could be further from the truth. They say we are making misleading statements. I am sorry, but I would like the government to prove the opposite right now.

I see on the government side, Mr. Speaker, hon. members from a province faced with those problems. I have in front of me members from Quebec who know perfectly well the budget does not meet the expectations of Quebecers. In front of me I have 74 members who, as usual, will not have the guts to face up to their basic responsibilities and their duties as Members of Parliament. And this is not the first time. I may be lucky to be the only one, but it is Quebec's tough luck to have 74 members on the other side. That is Quebec's tragedy, to have six dozen members of Parliament who do not meet their commitment and their promise.

Before concluding, I would like to recall that two years ago the same people were supporting their great leader who was saying in a short commercial: With an 18-cent increase in the price of gas, farmers cannot even afford to crank their tractors. In a second commercial aimed at another group, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) repeated this a hundred times during that campaign. With the 18-cent tax on gas, fishermen cannot afford to go where the fish are. So where are the fish today? How are the fishermen and the farmers doing? You people from Quebec and from ridings in other provinces, how are your farmers doing? At least we were honest enough to say exactly how much it would cost, but the previous government did not have the courage to apply those increases to meet the needs and the objectives we had set for ourselves, namely, self-sufficiency by 1990. You have failed there. Mr. Speaker, I would have many other comments to make. If they had honoured the agreement we had already concluded with Alberta, Canada would not be in the position it is in today. I conclude, Mr. Speaker. This is a catastrophic budget. This government has led us to the brink. We are in an economic slump the likes of which Canada has never seen before, thanks to the support of the Quebec Liberal members. I would urge those six dozen members, at least one dozen, to grasp the significance of their responsibilities and to act in such a way that this minister will not go on doing so much harm to Canadians and Quebecers.

● (2100)

[English]

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak in favour of the motion before us tonight. The motion refers to the budget of November 12 and its amendment on December 18 and suggests that the budget should be withdrawn and replaced by a new budget. We in the New Democratic Party certainly support that and would look forward to a budget which would deal effectively with some of the economic challenges facing this country instead of the rather limp wrist budget we have before us presently.