

make enough money to be taxpayers and they are the ones who are being severely hurt by this budget.

Cut, cut, cut might not hurt some of the average citizens but it certainly will hurt those with lower incomes. If you stop to think about the cap on the Canada Assistance Plan, on health care costs, the transfers payments to the provinces by the federal government, all have been drastically cut which in turn ends up putting a further cost on the people.

Another area where people have been hurt is in the pay equity program. The government is literally cancelling the pay equity commitment that it made to the people of Canada, disabled people and women in particular. That has been cut back.

She acknowledged that the government really should have paid down the deficit in the glory years from 1984 to 1988. I love to bring up this point in the House of Commons. Between 1984 and 1988 this government realized—it does not tell us the exact figures—I understand in the area of \$100 billion excess revenue over what was anticipated and we do not have one idea what it did with that money. The government will not tell us. I have been trying for three and a half years to find that out.

Who does the Court Challenges Program hurt?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): If the hon. member does not put her question, she will not get an answer.

Mrs. Gaffney: I would like the member to respond to those little people who she says have not been hurt. I think they have been hurt drastically, and I would like the hon. member for Calgary Southwest to comment on that.

Mrs. Sparrow: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the questions from my colleague. I know she works hard on behalf of her constituents.

There are a lot of people who are unemployed. They have lost their jobs over the last few years, and I certainly admit to that. We are going through a change right around the world where we have to become more productive and competitive.

It is very interesting chairing the committee on industry, science and technology with my colleagues from the

The Budget

other side. One thing we learned very clearly is that we simply have to educate better, train and retrain better. No longer can Canadians rely on the natural resources that we were blessed with to maintain our standard of living. Within the global trading community, we are all going to have to change our goals and our futures.

One thing that we have done is set aside \$2.8 billion with regard to the Unemployment Insurance Act for training people out of work. I recognize that a lot more has to be done. By the way, there was a surplus in 1979 of \$332 million and when we came in, in 1984, that \$332 million had changed to a \$38.5 billion deficit. Let us not be blaming each other. Let us work for common goals.

Mr. John Brewin (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, earlier the House heard in this debate from the Minister for Veterans Affairs. I did not get an opportunity to ask him directly to comment so I will do it, if I can, by asking this member for a comment on the issue of merchant mariners.

Recently the veterans affairs committee tabled a report calling on the government to provide benefits equivalent of veterans to those who served in our merchant marine during the war and who served Canada and the allied cause honourably and with great courage. Years and years have passed. The time has surely come for the government to act on the committee's recommendation.

Last Friday we received a comment saying that the government was going to get around to it. I wonder if the member—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the question is not relevant to the member who spoke. Therefore the questions and comments are completed.

Mr. René Soetens (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise today to speak in the budget debate and to mention the benefits that have and will accrue to my constituents and to Canada as a whole.

First I want to compliment the minister. This is my fourth budget as a member of Parliament. I found today that it certainly has been a very open process, open in many contexts. For example, the first ministers from across Canada travelled to Ottawa to publicly, in front of television, tell the Canadian people what they wanted to