

Supply

market and therefore we are stuck and we have very high unemployment.

If government knew it could not get approval of this \$50 billion unless it found \$2 billion or \$3 billion for capital projects, I bet that money would be found pretty quickly. It would find it fast. That is the point I am trying to make. It has all the leverage on that side of the House. What we are trying to do is appeal on behalf of the two million unemployed that in this approval of \$50 billion you are getting of Canadian taxpayers' money, find \$2 billion or \$3 billion to put people back to work or to prop up the retraining fund.

• (2140)

I know there is absolutely no room in this economy for any tax increases. If anyone had mentioned today the idea of a tax increase in this economy, I think they would be shot on the spot and no one would even care. We are not talking tax increases here.

I do think there are enough assets, good will, skilled labour, and talent in this country that we can afford another couple of billion dollars on the deficit to put people back to work.

I am not treating that lightly. We spent \$35 billion last year on welfare payments and unemployment insurance. Would it not be better to add another \$2 billion or \$3 billion to that and get some capital works projects going and get people back into the work force so that they can have their dignity back? Then they would become taxpayers.

I just received a note from my colleague from Cochrane—Superior. There are currently 30,000 unemployment insurance recipients who run out of benefits every month. Most of them end up on welfare. There is no retraining. The funds are gone and very few job opportunities exist because—and the member for Carleton—Charlotte was so right when he agreed with us on this—the cartel of financial institutions in this country right now is doing very little to stimulate, help, and push along the 1,700,000 small and medium-sized enterprises in this country that are our greatest hope for putting people back to work.

I compliment the member for the idea that he put forward to this House and to the nation, that if anybody

does not feel they are being treated fairly by their bank, the Minister of Finance will welcome hearing from them. I think that is a step in the right direction.

It is very tough in 10 minutes to talk about what is going on in a package of \$50 billion. It is very tough but it would be irresponsible for us on this side of the House to look the other way when we have close to two million people who are out of work and not enjoying this zero inflation. They are only enjoying the pain of the zero inflation and the low interest rates.

Once again we appeal to the government. We on this side of the House are begging you to go through this bill appropriating \$50 billion and see if you can find something that will help put those unemployed people back to work as soon as we can.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu): Madam Speaker, I will be brief so that my fellow members can also speak on this.

I think that a fairly clear consensus came out of what I heard today on the motion by the President of Treasury Board for consideration of a deficit budget for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1993, a budget that all members here in the House called lacking in courage and especially lacking in new ideas to fight this deficit that is eating away at our economy and our future.

It is with this in mind that I address the hon. member who just spoke about cuts and making better use of money. For example, does he agree in this recession with the government in its budget this year? We know that last year it spent \$2 billion more than it forecast the year before. Does the previous speaker, since I must address him through you, Madam Speaker, also agree that we are wasting, for example, \$40 million on advertising this year to tout the benefits of Canada's 125th anniversary, without forgetting all the incredible mistreatment of francophones in those 125 years and also of the native people? It is spending \$40 million to brag about that on television and it will waste \$600,000 next week on a monument to the Queen of England. Would we not do better to cut such foolish, frivolous expenses as sending 12 members of Parliament to the earth summit in Rio with the Prime Minister? Would it not have been enough for the Minister of the Environment and the Prime