

*Supply*

Coming from a region that is one-fifth of Ontario, almost the size of the Atlantic provinces put together, that fits in my riding, people have to understand that there is tremendous potential for economic growth given the right kind of policies. These are the policies that I am trying to relate tonight.

I want to conclude by saying that there are many decisions reflected in the budget estimates which hold promise for me and a renewed and vibrant future within the small business community which I talked about extensively in my speech.

Although I have expressed concerns for northern infrastructure and certain resource sectors, I want to stress again, as I have said to my colleagues opposite, that I am confident that if this government does not do what the previous government did, and that is lose its way and forget why we are here and why the people put us here, we will put the kind of policies in place that even the members opposite will cheer.

I know the member for Beaver River will stand up and cheer with me as she has done on numerous occasion when we were in opposition and did get our way on occasion.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, now that my name has been mentioned I feel I should stand up and say something.

I do appreciate the hon. member's comments. I realize what a huge geographic area he has to represent. He is quite right when he states that we did sit together for some months or even years I think at the beginning of the last Parliament, and I did appreciate that.

I want to address a couple of things which he talked about. We in the Reform Party caucus said that we have one or two areas that we want to cut. Let me make it very plain that we would only start with one or two areas. There are dozens and dozens of areas in all of these main estimates that need to be cut; not just that it is a good idea, but it is absolutely necessary. Only then will forestry, mines and all these other things be able to take first place, as they should.

However, if there is no money left in the federal coffers then there is going to be nothing to help out any sort of social programs that the member needs in his area. We know that there are certain things absolutely necessary there.

If we focus on one part of the red book and not on the other part of the red book in which he refers to and the Liberals always refer to the fact that we need to cut spending to make sure that there is money available, we are not just talking about one or two areas that we need to cut but dozens and dozens in order to save those social nets and in order to make sure that programs and policies in his constituency are going to go ahead.

With the debt rate going up at an incredible rate of thousands and thousands of dollars every minute that will do more to harm any social programs or any forestry or mines or infrastructure programs that are going on his riding. Perhaps he could respond to that.

**Mr. Nault:** Mr. Speaker, I am much better in debate than I am at making speeches. I appreciate that the member would entice me to get involved in the debate.

One of the things that concerns me about the Reform Party's continued approach of the zero in three, which was part of its main plank in its campaign, that it could reduce the deficit in three years, is the fact that Canadians did not believe it.

• (2020)

If in fact they did believe the Reform Party, it would be sitting over here and I would be sitting over there. Let us face it, there are times when members in the opposition, when members of Parliament continue to suggest things that may appear to be a good political tool to get governments to react to certain issues. We lay down the facts and give the numbers as the Reform has done. I am one of those who has read the direction you would like to go as far as reducing the deficit in three years.

For example, if it reduced \$20 billion, which is what it suggested roughly during the campaign, if you take the very conservative estimate of a reduction of a billion in an export economy, a billion dollars relates to 15,000 jobs of reduced activity per billion. It does not take a rocket scientist, as has been mentioned on the opposite side, to figure out how many jobs would be lost if we reduced that quickly out of an economy that is used to having \$20 billion creating economic activity.

What I am suggesting is that we would not have 11 per cent unemployment, we would probably have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 17, 18 per cent unemployment.

I am a history buff and my colleague who sits on the committee opposite me will know that in the thirties there was a Conservative by the name of Bennett who tried the same thing, who used the approach that the quicker you slash everything the quicker you will get more economic activity. He drove the economy of Canada right into the ground completely within a period of three or four years. He said: "It is an international recession, we cannot do anything about it".

My understanding, and the history books will prove this, is that as soon as the Liberal government came back in after Mr. Bennett and reversed those programs, the economy took off and we started to make money again, people started to pay taxes and we started to pay our debt off.

That is the only issue that I am relating to members on the opposite side. People do not believe that if you were in govern-