

Supply

do with the serious debt and deficit problems we are facing is an absolute sham. This is the same government that pursued high interest and high dollar policies. It insisted inflation was the monster that had to be killed and at the same time caused our debt to increase because of its own high interest rate policies.

• (1515)

An hon. member: Misplaced policies.

Mrs. Marleau: Misplaced. It brought down a budget which caused the Canadian bond rating agency to downgrade our credit rating and caused an increase of 33 basis points in our interest rates.

One might say that is not a very large amount. Maybe, if one is only borrowing \$1,000 or \$2,000, it is not a large amount. However it is large when we consider the amounts of money the government has to borrow on a day-to-day basis. I say: "Shame. You have played with Canadians one more time. You have cost us and you continue to cost us dearly. Meanwhile you go off on your trips, spend money and do what you want, pretending all along that you are the ones who are fiscally responsible".

If this government were fiscally responsible the first thing it would do is ask the Prime Minister to stay home and write a letter, make a phone call or send a fax. It would be a lot more cost efficient. We could deal with a number of other issues such as the renewal of contracts to its friends before the election. Again it is an extremely costly endeavour. The renewing of leases will cost Canadians millions of dollars but benefit the friends of this government.

They cannot speak from both sides of their mouths. These people have done it and continue to try to pull the wool over Canadians' eyes. Canadians know better. They understand that the Tories are the people who have caused the mess we are in today.

I read an article today in a newspaper which I do not have with me. It indicated that the Tories have caused the poor to become poorer, that Tory policies in effect have decreased the average take home wages of middle income Canadians and that they are in effect no better off today than they were in 1976.

I say to the Tories shame. This whole sham has to stop. We have to start speaking honestly and openly. We are not in an auction as to how fast we can pretend to decrease the deficit. We have to be realistic.

We have to represent average Canadians, the ones who foot the bill for the nasty programs this government has put in place. They are the ones whose children are in their twenties and do not have jobs. They are the ones who are worried about losing their own jobs, about making payments on their homes, about educating their children and about sending them on to university in the fall when tuition fees are rising. These same young people do not have jobs.

There is nothing we need more than a new government that will change the focus and start considering average middle income Canadians who make up the bulk of this country. Until we start considering what happens to them this country will not survive. The sooner we can start working together again for honest and realistic goals, the better off we will be.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, on a question or comment perhaps the hon. member for Sudbury who is attacking this budget could tell this House why the Liberal Party voted last Wednesday for a national child care program, for an infrastructure program and for a national jobs plan.

• (1520)

The national child care program has been priced at \$20 billion. A year ago her party suggested \$5 billion from the provinces, \$5 billion from the municipalities and \$5 billion from the federal government on an infrastructure program, for a total of another \$15 billion. I do not know what a national job plan would cost but presumably it is more billions.

In view of the very conservative-type speech she gave about debts, deficits and bond rating agencies I was wondering whether she could explain the consistency of her vote last week and her speech today.

Mrs. Marleau: Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no problem answering the concerns of this worthy gentleman across the way.

We have to set goals for ourselves. We have to pick priorities. It is not a question of absolute dollars and cents. It is a question of what we think is a high priority. The highest priority is not a helicopter flying on some unknown and probably unnecessary mission.

The question is: What do we do with all our young children out there, most of whom or at least large numbers of whom are being raised in single parent homes? Is it not better to place them above fancy toys? I