

*The Budget—Mr. Maltais*

As an example, I direct you to page 42. There are more errors—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but I must inform him that the time provided for his speech has expired.

**Mr. Stevens:** May I just take one minute to sum up?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Is there unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member to continue?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Stevens:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Hon. Members for giving me a little more time. Hopefully it is the truth that they like to hear, and they would like to hear a little more of it.

I would refer Hon. Members to page 45 of the same fiscal plan. There it is said that the total expenditures contemplated for this year are \$100,100,000,000. Can you believe it? That is almost \$2 billion a week that the Minister has us spending. When he took over, the expenditures were \$10 billion for a full year. Now they are up to ten times that amount in fiscal 1984. But he says that the amount of total expenditures in 1984 will be \$100,100,000,000. Next year they will be \$105,900,000,000, and the next year he says they will be \$112,700,000,000. Oddly enough, if we are to believe the Minister's budget speech, every one of those figures is wrong. Who is right?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if you wish more knowledge of the errors made by this Minister, I would recommend that you read page 46. It contains quite a few errors. In short, we have found dozens of errors in the statistical information that has been offered as backup to this budget.

It is not only that the Minister does not know what he is doing, it is not only that \$200 million has been added, but he does not know where he will spend it. The hard fact is on that side of the House no one knows where they are going in an economic sense. Unfortunately it is the Canadian public, through the loss of jobs, the high taxation, the almost unbearable interest rates we have had to live with since they took over, who has to pay the sad penalty.

● (1700)

[Translation]

**Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today in order to comment on the Budget speech that was given yesterday. Indeed, I believe Canadians have been waiting for a long time for a budget that would be really structured and which would focus on job creation. Moreover, I come from an area which is severely distressed today, namely the North Shore, where we have to deal daily not with statistics but with people. A minute ago, I was listening to the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) who pointed out so-called statistical errors in some of the papers that have been introduced. It is all

very well to engage in rhetoric or academic work, but it is much more important to work directly with people in order to ascertain whether action taken actually brings about a solution to a given problem, that is, unemployment.

I especially want to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), Mr. Speaker, for acting on what people have been telling him for the past six or seven months. The Minister met and consulted with every group in our society, with the organized and non-organized, to ensure that the budget would truly respond to the expectations of Canadians. Of course it was impossible to respond to everyone's expectations to the same extent, but if we listen to what people are saying in Canada today, it seems the Minister has put his finger on the problem and taken the right approach to solving it.

What did the Minister of Finance actually propose, Mr. Speaker? He proposed, first of all, a series of measures that will provide \$2.4 billion for direct job creation, and he also provided for \$2.4 billion for the private sector, to stimulate the economy. That is what the Minister of Finance did last night. Of course people can talk about the deficit and say they would have acted differently, but when the Minister of Finance identified the two main aspects of his budget, he said with respect to direct job creation and public spending that the purpose was to create infrastructures and public facilities that would be used by future generations. That is what I call productive investment, and the Opposition should understand this. It is easy to say: they are going to spend for the sake of spending, but the Minister of Finance clearly said, and it is there in his budget, that these were projects planned for the next ten, fifteen or twenty years, and instead, they will be started this year in order to provide jobs.

**An Hon. Member:** And the debt!

**Mr. Maltais:** I heard the Member opposite tell the House: And the debt! Remember the *New Deal* in the United States! What did they do after the Great Depression in the United States? They introduced a very similar policy, that is, they spend public funds on public facilities that would be used for many years. That is a very important point.

I feel I am on very familiar ground here, Mr. Speaker, because as I said before, I live in an area that has been severely affected by the economic situation, not because of the President of the Iron Ore Company, not because of the present Government, but because of the depressed state of the world market for iron ore. However, we are eagerly awaiting a capital project that will help develop and diversify industry in the region, and I am referring to a National Harbours Board project. I hope it is included in the 100 projects the Minister is expected to announce within the next few weeks. However, without the clear thinking of the Government and the Minister of Finance and without the Government's help, would our people be prepared to accept proposals from an Opposition that is saying that this is not the right approach? During the