

always at conflict with itself. There is always a creative tension between the two.

● (1120)

This is the true meaning of a Progressive Conservative philosophy. Those who are dumbfounded by the combination of progressivism with conservatism must be unaware of the inherent contradictions within human nature. They perhaps are the ones who have sought an overly simplistic solution through socialism or liberalism. But those who are aware that man implies contradictions look for a political philosophy that embraces this dichotomy. They will find it in Progressive Conservatism as long as we do not err too much in favour of either tradition. When we emphasize too much the tradition of authority and order, the philosophy becomes repressive. When we forget about the tradition of order and think only of the libertarian tradition, we become anarchists. A Progressive Conservative stands equally on both founding traditions: order with liberty, liberty with order. This provides our working framework within which issues can be debated and resolved.

The riding of Etobicoke-Lakeshore is in so many respects like every other part of this country. On September 15 when Constable David Dunmore was shot and killed in our riding, this did not change but merely reinforced the attitude which most of my constituents and I share about the need to have the restoration in this country of capital punishment in cases where that is required. We have in this country a range of crimes from theft of a 25-cent newspaper all the way up to murder and assassination. We also have sanctions to fit those crimes ranging from small fines up to the most serious sanctions that can be applied. I think that in light of the time we have now had in Canada without capital punishment, this Parliament should consider in a free vote the restoration of capital punishment so that in cases where, after due process of law and trial before a jury, a person has been found guilty of first degree murder, a judge has the option to impose that sanction.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyer: There is a great deal more I would like to say, Sir, and the temptation for any Member in his or her first speech is like making a Dagwood sandwich—, you are hungry, you are just at the fridge and you want all of it at once. I am sure though that in the time ahead there will be other opportunities.

Let me say that I shall represent the men and women of Etobicoke-Lakeshore with all my mental and physical energy as a supporter of the Brian Mulroney Progressive Conservative Government. I shall strive in every way possible to bring about a new era of reconciliation, of economic renewal and of social justice. Always I shall fight for fair shares to all and special privileges for none.

I come to this Thirty-third Parliament as the Member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore with a heart that feels pride in Canada, with a spirit that is at once optimistic and tempered by realism, with ears to listen to all points of view expressed here,

The Address—Mr. Boyer

with a mind that I shall try to keep open to weigh the possibilities, the proposals, and the contending ideas brought before Parliament, and with a tongue to speak here not of personalities or of prejudice, but of policy and of principle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments?

● (1125)

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore (Mr. Boyer) reiterated the claim of most members on the Government side that jobs were a very high priority of that Party and of that Government. However, we note in the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) that he announced substantial cuts in funding for research, for forestry, for fisheries and for agriculture. These are three of the most basic industries which employ hundreds of thousands of Canadian citizens. In all these fields we are in very tough competition with other countries. In the private sector these industries have been noteworthy for their failure to involve themselves or to do very much in the way of research. These cuts will mean lay-offs of hundreds, if not thousands, of permanent employees doing very important work for the people of Canada. They are permanent jobs of people who work for the federal Government.

How does the Hon. Member square his claim that the Government is committed to more jobs with these cuts and their effects on research?

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's question is very important because it throws into sharp relief, for the benefit of the House and everyone listening to the debate, the fundamental difference between the approach of the New Democratic Party and the approach of the Progressive Conservative Party toward the issue of creating jobs in Canada. In fact, in a moment I will say something about the position of the Liberal Party.

Our view is that long-term and meaningful jobs have to come from the private sector. We cannot spend government money to create jobs in ways which are not authentic or indigenous and growing out of an organically strong economy. Our approach is to do all that we can to foster economic renewal in the private sector.

No one here for a moment is pretending that research and development is not important. We are asking a fundamental question: At this time in Canada's evolution, does the spending on that have to come from taxpayers, or can it not better come from those in the private sector who understand what is moving and motivating the complex operation of the world economy? They know where new research needs to be done and applied in the production of goods and services.

We have sent a very clear signal to the country. The debate so far on the part of the New Democratic Party is well grounded in the traditions of that Party. I listened with interest to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) the other day when he talked about limits to growth and the whole approach that we have to put absolute clamps