

I hope that the Minister of Finance and all the ministers who have cut their spendings . . . We are not necessarily against cuts, we did ask for them, but I would like to know if serious assessments have been made and I would like to make sure that the province of Quebec particularly, and other members from that province will mention it, will not be unduly penalized by those budget cuts.

Until now this government has not been able to answer and I am quite sure that these cuts were made without any serious analysis, and I think we should blame this government for it. How could this government possibly maintain its credibility when there has been nearly 500,000 young people on unemployment rolls for over a year? And they will tell us all about Bill C-14 when this government has allowed the number of unemployed to reach 1.5 million. We are talking about one million unemployed but 500,000 more are not even registered. As we exceed the one million unemployed level, in the name of spending reduction they go after that category of unemployed who have no other alternative but welfare and I consider that this proposal is inhuman and ill-advised. Of course there has been some abuse in that department and in the administration of the government administration which was unable to identify those abuses soon enough. We will not blame the government because it wants to set things straight, on the contrary.

If the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) is really convinced that through these savings he can create 350,000 jobs under the 14 programs he announced—the few assessments that were made do not guarantee that he will reach his objectives—but if the minister is convinced that he can create 350,000 jobs, why did he not implement those programs sooner? And if he can really create 350,000 jobs, Bill C-14 might become useless because that number of job opportunities will reduce the unemployment rate by 30 per cent. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to prove that the minister will succeed in meeting his objectives and if we base ourselves on the falsehood of the predictions made by the Minister of Finance since he has assumed his present portfolio, we are quite entitled to think that the Minister of Employment and Immigration will not meet his own objectives and that, Mr. Speaker is a troublesome matter. There is also an attempt to win back public confidence.

I stated earlier that little concern was given to those affected when certain cutbacks were unilaterally decided. How can this government regain public confidence when Canadians have not forgotten its position on the sales tax last summer? How can this government gain public confidence after having pledged ten times over to build Place Guy Favreau which is a project which has just been started very recently? How is it possible to trust this government which has implemented a dairy policy which has compelled thousands of milk producers to leave this market, not to mention the fact that it is still refusing indexation?

**An hon. Member:** It is not true.

*The Budget—Mr. La Salle*

**Mr. La Salle:** No, it is true. Mr. Speaker, a member opposite is telling me that it is not true. Hundreds of milk producers have been compelled to give up production some two years ago because of bad management, bad projections and bad advice on the part of the then minister of agriculture and all members know that. Of course he is careful enough not to try to justify this position. All these factors, Mr. Speaker, can only lead to distrust for this government. Nobody has yet complained on the other side. We are being told that the users of commuter trains in the Montreal area will probably have to pay 50 per cent extra for their daily ticket in order to travel from their homes to their places of employment. Here is a form of penalty because the government allows itself to forecast increases in production costs and wages, yet it will accept without a word of protest an increase of 50 per cent for the users of commuter trains in the Montreal area.

● (2032)

That seems to me a flagrant breach of the guidelines it set for itself. For a long time, Mr. Speaker, we have been perfectly aware that because the federal government kept refusing to write off the deficits of the CNR, that is why the users of commuter trains are going to have to pay an extraordinary increase. And I know that several members are very concerned by that and I simply ask them to exert pressures on their own government so it will come back to reason. This afternoon I heard an hon. member on the government side talk about reducing the age of retirement to 64. He was referring to incentives and services—

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Laval on a point of order.

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would accept a question?

**Mr. La Salle:** No, Mr. Speaker. I know those questions and hon. members opposite had the opportunity to speak on this. And I did not hear the hon. member for Laval rise to blame the minister for the increase I am referring to. That is his business but I am doing so as a Quebecker and I think he should do the same, I think I have to do it—

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Laval on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to rise on a question of privilege because when he talks about commuter trains the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) is referring to a jurisdiction that is purely provincial and highly recognized by the Liberal government three years ago and turned down—