

Mr. Speaker, I could say a lot more about this excellent budget, and I would ask Hon. Members to support the motion put forth by Minister Wilson, and of course reject the Opposition motion.

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance. I will start with one, in order to give a chance to other Members. And anyway, this is a question I had already asked during the debate on the borrowing authority legislation. He stated that the Liberals wasted \$6 billion before the elections, because when they came to power they found themselves with a \$38 billion deficit, and that this Conservative Government has been reducing the deficit year after year. First, I would like to tell him that this is not quite the truth, because, last year, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) had proposed a \$29.5 billion deficit and we now get a \$32 billion deficit that is equal to the last budget's last deficit, the last full deficit under the Liberal administration, that is \$32 billion in 1983-84. So there is no reduction from three years ago. But in 1984-85 and 1985-86, there still was an increase of some \$6 billion in tax receipts. Yet, the deficit at the end of 1986 is the same. Now, could he tell me—I believe he has had the time to figure it out and look at it—where those \$6 billion have gone and how it is that after increasing taxes by \$6 billion since they came to power, the deficit at the end of 1986 is \$32 billion, just as it was in 1984?

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague the Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard—Anjou (Mr. Gagliano) for his question. When we took over, the deficit reached \$38 billion. The first year, we brought it down to \$34 billion, the following year to \$32 billion, and this year to \$29 billion. I suggest we have done a very good job.

Unfortunately, the Hon. Member for Saint-Léonard—Anjou does not seem to know that the cost of social programs increases every year. For instance, Mr. Speaker, Old Age Security Pension benefits, family allowances, and transfer payments to the provinces are increasing. While it is true that Government revenues have increased, so have expenses. This is simple mathematics and if my hon. friend wants to be honest, he will have to admit that transfer payments to the provinces and social program benefits are responsible to a large extent for the increase in Government spending. He should not forget the debts incurred by the previous Government and which we must pay back. Interest payments on a debt do not go down when the debt is increasing; they grow and must be paid. They are responsible for the increase in our spending.

The Conservative Government currently administers the country with approximately 25 per cent of the overall government budget. International agreements which were signed before we came to power and which we all agree have to be adhered to, namely those concerning National Defence and CIDA. There are increases there too. There has been very little increase, if any, in the expenses which the Government

The Budget—Mr. Vincent

controls. That is not where the increase is occurring. Revenues must increase, because the remaining expenses are increasing.

Mr. Grondin: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to tell my colleague from Trois-Rivières (Mr. Vincent) that he is right to say that we see budgets differently. That is obvious. First, the Budget was brought down in the House, and then we were told about the expenditures projected by the Government for the coming year. We were then able to see that there is a relationship between the Budget and the Main Estimates for 1987-88, and this relationship gave us food for thought. Of course, everything that we had expected after the Budget was brought down was later confirmed by the Main Estimates.

Where I disagree with my colleague from Trois-Rivières is when he says that I simply read what had been written by other people and spent my time saying that the Government would not be re-elected. I think there is some truth in the latter, and as for his claim that what I said was written by others, we could hardly be expected to speak to a variety of issues since the Budget failed to reflect any specific policies or make positive forecasts for Canada's future.

And I don't think that my answers to questions or what I was able to contribute on the youth problem and the total absence of any policies or forecasts in this respect, I don't think this was mentioned by anyone else, Mr. Speaker, since even the Minister of State for Youth, in his speech on the Budget, never mentioned the word "young" or "youth". And why should he, since there was absolutely nothing in the Budget for young people.

As for *Hot 100*, I simply want to say to the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières that the layout is very good, and I said as much in my speech. The booklet is put together quite well, but unfortunately, aside from certain programs that existed before, if we look for programs that were introduced by the Conservative Government since 1984, I'm afraid the Hon. Member will have to admit they were conspicuous by their absence from this publication.

As far as Challenge '87, Challenge '86, or Challenge '85 go, I do not think my colleague can accuse me of ever having spoken against this program. What we denounce is the Challenge program funding, in light of other increases. Among other things, I am referring to minimum wage levels in the various provinces, particularly in Ontario and Quebec this year, and to the difficulties we experienced when attempting to obtain additional funds to compensate for the extra \$30 million which had been earmarked for the 1986 census summer program. These \$30 million have been cut back this year and, no matter what my colleague from Trois-Rivières may say, it translates into so many fewer jobs. Fewer jobs will be available this year, unless they plan to reduce the salaries to be paid to young people hired under the Challenge '87 program.