

Supply

In light of those developments in my own province, does the Hon. Member blame the people of Saskatchewan for being a little bit cynical about some of the talk they are hearing about the environment from this Government?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleague that over \$10 million has been spent on agriculture alone. Since he mentioned the speech made by the Minister this morning, I would also like to remind him of the continued commitment of the Minister of the Environment, the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Bouchard), to the cause of the environment. I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to welcome Minister Bouchard to my constituency less than two weeks ago when he spoke at a fund-raising dinner which, by the way, was a big success.

In his speech at the dinner, Minister Bouchard talked about his involvement, his work and his determination since being appointed to that position. He is especially determined to amend the 1971 legislation which, as you know, only affects paper mills built after 1971 and to introduce a new law ensuring that paper mills, an important industry in my region, stop polluting and become responsible corporate citizens who obey the law and can make economic progress while respecting the environment and the citizens of my region.

Since you are indicating, Mr. Speaker, that my time is up, I will stop here.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. I recognize the Hon. Member for Mission—Coquitlam on debate.

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, there is an old Chinese proverb that says that a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. Thursday, the Government took the first giant step toward turning social policy in Canada into welfare policy.

The first words in the Budget speech were: "This Budget is about the future of Canada". I suggest that the first words should have been: "This Budget is about the survival of Canadians".

The budget speech goes on to say that it is about what we must do to respond to the challenges and opportunities of a changing world, to assert our sovereignty as a confident and mature nation, to meet our new and continuing priorities as a people. What are those priorities?

Have they changed so drastically that the Government can be allowed to meet its deficit responsibility with further attacks on the family, with further attacks on our children, with further attacks on the elderly, with attacks on women, with attacks on the unemployed, with attacks on ethnic groups, with attacks on the working poor?

The budget speech refers to valued social programs, high standards of living, economic opportunities, sovereignty at home and respect abroad, and responsible government, that this is the Canada we must leave to our children. I submit that we are in fact maintaining a high standard of living for those Canadians who already enjoy a high standard of living and are condemning those Canadians who are struggling to survive.

We are planning deficit reduction at the wrong end of the scale and trying to sell it as a program to save the futures of our children. It is telling Canadian children "do not worry that you have no shoes, do not worry that you are hungry, do not worry that there is no one to look after you while your folks work and, for goodness sake, do not worry that you have no roofs over your heads". Do without these things now, and the Minister of Finance guarantees that when you grow up you will inherit a fully paid for Rolls Royce.

• (1540)

I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance and his colleagues, were they in the House, that no one is fooled by this. No one is going to buy the argument except those who will profit by it, and those surely are not the children of Canada or their families. The Government would have us believe that it is spending more than ever on the things that are important to Canadian families. Is it indeed? I submit that the smoke and mirrors of numbers is wearing mighty thin. This Government can move numbers around and tell Canadians it is not going to hurt them, but they are not going to buy it.

Hon. Members on the Government side of the House may ask: What is the Member from Mission—Coquitlam saying? We are spending \$2.7 million of Canadians' money to prove to them that what we are telling them is the truth, using very high priced wordsmiths to put forward our argument. What this Hon. Member from Mission—Coquitlam is saying is that Canadians are not fooled. The retired millworker in Mission—Coquitlam