

The Budget

I am going to be very short. I am going to address the issue of jobs and job creation. In this budget, \$725 million in UI cuts means 40,000 jobs. A \$6 billion infrastructure program means 65,000 jobs. Sixty-five thousand and forty thousand certainly does not add up to 1.2 million. That is currently the number of people in this country who are out of work.

I am having a really hard time understanding how this disparity of 100,000-plus jobs is supposed to get 1.2 million-plus people in Canada back to work. I would like the hon. member to respond to that, please.

Mrs. Terrana: Mr. Speaker, I can see the concern and I know it is only 10 per cent of what we need.

With the infrastructure program it is not just roads and the infrastructure we need. Some moneys are also set aside for arts centres. Fifteen per cent of it is earmarked for other programs.

I would like to say that this is another opportunity to increase jobs. I would also like to say that we cannot get 1.2 million jobs on the first budget and we cannot get the deficit down while trying to do some work in the area of the economics of the country.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the hon. member for the quality of her maiden speech. Many of us here have had to make this first speech, and it is always a rather moving experience.

I have a comment about a remark she made in her speech on the change of direction brought about by the new government. We, on this side of the House, do not agree at all that there has been change, considering some significant items in the budget. For instance, this is the record deficit. Never before had the government forecast a \$39 billion deficit. There is also the increase in the number of weeks of work needed for entitlement to unemployment insurance benefits coupled with a reduction in the number of weeks people can get these benefits. To me, this looks much more like a continuation of the previous Conservative government's policy.

That is why Canadians and Quebecers find it very hard to accept the results of this budget. During last week recess, people told me this was another case of all talk and no action, since after telling us for two months how serious the situation was, the government ended up with no real cuts. It is just business as usual.

I have a second brief remark. The hon. member said that she wanted to work with Quebec members at building a united Canada. I would invite her to work at making sure that Canada and Quebec set up structures that would make them able to face

global competition in the years ahead. In that regard, Canadian federalism no longer represents the kind of structure that will allow us to be competitive in the global market.

Mrs. Terrana: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to comment on the second remark of my colleague. The fact that Quebec has tried to separate from Canada for many years did have an impact on our economy. It is well known that problems are not limited to Quebec but affect the whole country. I believe that, as we say in Italy, united we stand, divided we fall. I do not know how they say it in France, but we say that unity is strength.

As to the first remark on a new direction for our country, I must say I am convinced there is indeed a new direction. This is our first budget, and it was tabled only four months after the government came into office. It is the first of two phases, and the second one will come next year. It will then be possible to discuss the budgetary content because we will have all the findings of the consultation process. The opposition may find that we are right in what we do and do it in the best interest of this country.

● (1140)

[English]

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the whip of the Reform Party, I would like to advise the House that pursuant to Standing Order 43 our speakers on this motion will be dividing their time.

I am more than pleased to address an area of concern that is very real to Canadians. Last week I spent time in my riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam, the first extended opportunity I had to meet with individuals and groups since the budget was introduced. I was met with three main areas of concern, two of which I would like to touch on today.

The first topic is the budget. The other is immigration. Both deal in very real terms with the concern of ordinary Canadians about the future directions and opportunities of Canada.

Most Canadians view the budget of February 1994 as a stop-gap measure, an attempt, however feeble, at holding the line on the deficit and yet it has not done too much damage in their own backyard. Predictably those whose livelihoods have been directly affected through base closures or wage freezes or other means are angry. Others who have watched our nation's economy closely through the last several decades are angry.

I put to it the House that this budget is a failure and that all Canadians should be angry.

Canada's debt and deficit situation is now at a point at which it is affecting every individual and every business through exorbitant taxation. Every personal paycheque is slashed by taxes and reduced buying power. Our debt load of over half a trillion