

the deficit and debt mess that we encountered in 1984 and we have been trying to fight that situation ever since.

Marc Lalonde was not the only Liberal finance minister guilty of those grave deceptions. Back in the 1960s, the Hon. Edgar Benson made similar remarks in the House of Commons. He said that he intended to continue severe restraint. The government's experience in the previous year and the prospects for the following year forced it to recognize the central problem of the control of public expenditures in Canada at the time. But again, Mr. Benson, as Minister of Finance, and subsequent finance ministers, did not abide by the principles they enunciated.

Now the members opposite in the Liberal party and the New Democratic party criticize us for enunciating those principles of financial responsibility and then abiding by them. That is the difference. They simply used those principles as rhetoric. We use them as a plan of action. So that is what the budget is all about. It is about reality. It is about the realities of the financial situation of the Government of Canada.

Our goal has to be that of getting our economic and financial house in order. Let us compare it with the family. Who would lend money to a family who for 20 years overspent its budget? They bought a new car when they could not afford a new car. They bought equipment for their homes, took vacations, and constantly overspent. Now would any banker or lender want to assist that family in future expenditures? They would say to them, no, that is not the way to operate. You have to go back and get control of your budget. You have to account for your revenues and relate your expenditures to those revenues.

That is very basic financial responsibility and it applies equally to any government or institution. Revenues have to relate to your expenditures. How can anybody complain in the House of Commons or anywhere else in Canada? As the Minister of Finance says: "I will tell you what we are going to do for 1990-1991 and all future years. We are going to relate our revenues as the government to our expenditures and we are going to bring them into balance." How can anybody quarrel with that?

### *The Budget*

What has happened over the last five years since the Progressive Conservative government took office in 1984. That is exactly what we have done. We have related our revenues to expenditures.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Crosby:** The member laughs, the member who is a part of the government that in 1984 allowed the national debt to rise to \$200 billion. They then say: "Why did you people not do something about it? Why did you not eliminate the debt and reduce the deficit to zero?" How could you possibly do that?

The members opposite and all other members of the House of Commons knows that it has to be a gradual process unless they are willing to cut off social programs.

**Mr. Manley:** What's left?

**Mr. Crosby:** They stand in the House and defend social programs and say: "Don't reduce social programs." Then they take away the financial ability to provide those social programs. Now that is hypocrisy of the worst kind, to pretend to defend social programs and to pretend to support social programs and their expansion and to look after needs as they are created in the Canadian public and then to deprive the government of the financial ability to do that. What sense does that make? Does anybody in Canada really believe that that is possible, to continue spending, not raise revenues and allow the deficiency and the deficit to occur year after year? I do not think any Canadian would fail to realize that that kind of process can lead to disaster.

The greatest threat to social programs is a bankrupt national treasury. I defy any member of the House of Commons to stand up and say that that is not the case. A bankrupt national treasury will not provide or support any social program. Just ask somebody from Argentina, Brazil or Poland about that.

People are always talking about eastern Europe. Look at eastern Europe and what is happening with the rise of democracy. But listen to Gorbachev, Walesa and Havel. They will tell you. The lesson they have learned in eastern Europe is you cannot go on spending and not producing. What they are saying to their workers and people is that they have got to be realistic about their economy. People have to work and contribute if they want any benefits from their society. That is what they found out in eastern Europe and that is why they are marching in Prague and in all those eastern European