

Government Orders

The actual spending has increased by \$3 billion this year. The member said they had made significant cuts in spending. That may be quite true but this is in proposed spending and projected spending not in real spending.

I can say I am going to spend \$50,000 next week on something and then cut it back to \$2,000. Can I take credit for saving \$48,000? This is the same type of accounting that the previous administration used and the Liberal government before that.

We have to start talking in real terms about what it is going to take to get this economy going again. It is not going to be credit card infrastructure programs. It is not going to be job creation programs for which there are no jobs once the people graduate from those programs or attain their apprenticeships.

It is going to come from private sector confidence and private investor confidence when they start investing in this country and expanding their business. That is where it is going to come from.

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's comments. In fact in as many days as I have spoken in this House the Reform Party has raised the issue of the infrastructure program. I would remind the hon. member that it is the infrastructure program that is in fact giving Canadians confidence. It is the package, if you will. That infrastructure program is what is spurring the confidence.

I agree with the hon. member that small and medium sized businesses create 80 per cent of the new jobs that are created in this economy. But if the government does nothing but cut without stimulating I would suggest to the hon. member that we are going to be mired in a deeper recession than the one we are getting out of.

It is a balance. That is what has impressed me the most about this Minister of Finance and about our government, that there has been a balanced realistic approach. The cuts represent \$17 billion.

I am one member who would have liked deeper cuts, faster cuts, but I have been convinced that this is a balanced approach and over the next three years we will be within 3 per cent of the GDP which I believe is responsible.

I would urge the hon. member, if he has some suggestion about what is wrong with our infrastructure program, to let us hear it. However I know a lot of people and a lot of municipalities are enjoying the benefits of the infrastructure program.

• (1745)

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to make a comment about the programs which my colleague mentioned and that are presently considered in his province of New Brunswick.

I do not know if the hon. member has read *La Presse* this morning, because one headline says: "New Brunswick wants to force single mothers to identify the father of their child", and I have followed the experiments that are being done in this field, "Those who will refuse will lose access to welfare". Is that the kind of model we want to give Canada?

[English]

Mr. Zed: Mr. Speaker, that is not the program I am referring to. The one I am referring to is an opportunity for young people to be trained in a specific area: perhaps an environmental project, a silviculture program as the lifeblood of New Brunswick is the wood industry, or some community based program. A program was recently announced for people over 50 years of age who would only be making about \$8,000 on welfare. In this pilot program 1,000 individuals will be eligible to receive \$12,000.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest): Mr. Speaker, my comments in these short 10 minutes were to be on the omnibus bill, a bit about UI reform and, if there were time, on the wage freeze. However the eloquent, noble and spirited defence of members opposite of the mother corporation CBC drove me to buy a newspaper to find out what the oracle of Canadian culture had in store for us tonight.

For the edification of members opposite and for those in television land, they can want see "All in the Family" at seven o'clock, "Blossom" at 7.30, "Fresh Prince of Bel-Air" at eight o'clock or at 8.30 "Fresh Prince of Bel-Air, Part II". Is the oracle of Canadian culture worthy of the money we are going to be borrowing from our children to pay for it? Does it need more money? Should we give it \$25 million so that it can get capital?

Let me deal, folks, with the Canada assistance plan because it is fairly serious.

An hon. member: That is the Canada assistance plan.

Mr. McClelland: Yes, it is.

The Deputy Speaker: First, it would be very much appreciated if the member would put his remarks to the Chair. It is a long established tradition. Second, the member actually has a 20-minute slot.

Mr. McClelland: I could go on at more length about the mother corporation in that case.

In any event, this omnibus bill in support of the budget is of great importance to our nation. As other members have said, it sets the stage for what is likely to happen over the next few years.

Under the Canada assistance plan, as members know, the Government of Canada was to fund generally speaking 50 per cent of the money the provinces must spend in the welfare programs they administered. A few years ago this was changed. The Canada assistance plan payments by the federal government to the three provinces of Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta were capped. The net result was that these provinces were