

*The Budget*

ment's budget. The president of the FTQ, Clément Godbout, said, "To effectively tackle the debt and deficit problem, we must put people back to work by creating jobs. However, this concern does not appear in the budget". For the FTQ, this is incomprehensible. Not only does the government not do anything to create jobs, but it is hitting the unemployed very hard by taking \$6 billion over the next three years from the unemployment insurance fund.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member must conclude his comments and ask his question as soon as possible.

**Mr. Nunez:** What does the Minister of Human Resources Development think of the unions' unanimous opposition to this government's budget, to its cuts to unemployment insurance and social programs?

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, what the unions said, as reported to us by the hon. member, is false, is not true. Indeed, the budget we brought down will create 180,000 jobs. I hope that the hon. member will send to union members in his riding messages of hope and not the ones being sent by the Bloc Québécois which say there is no hope for the unemployed. We are sending a positive message of hope. I hope he will relay it.

[English]

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but be astounded how a minister of a government can stand up and continuously say that spending more government money will create more jobs. Ultimately that money is going to turn into a higher deficit, more debt. When is that going to get paid off?

My question though is on the infrastructure program. I was told very recently by a mayor of a municipality that the infrastructure program was basically going to accommodate their program to build sewers and roads. All it is doing quite frankly is costing them one-third of the cost instead of the whole full cost—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The Minister of Human Resources Development.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** What happens—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member's question is clear enough.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** I am astounded equally by how members of the Reform Party do not have the economic sense to understand that when we put capital invest-

ment in new transportation, in new infrastructure, in improving productivity, we create new wealth for the country.

Do they have no understanding of how important it is to improve the productivity of the country and to help people get back to work?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** You don't know what economic sense is.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. Time has thankfully expired on the questions and answers.

• (1550)

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the budgetary policy of the government as presented by the Minister of Finance.

As a new member of Parliament and a member of the Standing Committee on Finance I listened intently to the minister's speech in the hope that this budget was going to be different. After cutting through the finance minister's wonderful rhetoric, the budget is nothing more than a continuation of the Trudeau philosophy that we can grow out of our economic problems.

That concept was the solution for a different problem at a different time. In fact, the only things that grow out of this budget are overall spending, up by \$3.3 billion, and the number of task forces, committees and hearings to determine and sell next year's budget. These new studies are up to about 15 new committees with three or four task forces.

I have said this before in the House and I will say it again. Total government revenues are projected at \$123.9 billion. Total expenditures are slightly less than this. It is the interest on the debt that creates the deficit of \$41 billion. Interest expenses on the federal debt now total 33 cents of every tax dollar. I submit that it is the debt and the interest expense to service the debt that puts in jeopardy the viability and flexibility of our existing programs.

The Minister of Finance has taken great pride in the unprecedented degree of consultation that his party sought in the preparation of the budget. What good is consultation when a government will not implement policies that people want and are demanding?

I fail to see the finance minister's so-called game plan that he claims to have presented in a budget that is full of wait-until-next-year promises. Spending increases are this year and all the big spending cuts are left for future years.

As a former professional football player I know the value and the purpose of a game plan. A game plan is about attacking a known obstacle or problem which in this case is the rising costs associated with servicing the debt.