

*Supply*

• (1610)

The member for North Vancouver is seized with the importance of having a fiscal monitor that is understood by people who do not have doctorate degrees in economics. I must say, somewhat sheepishly, that several of my constituents do not have doctorate degrees in economics but they know what it is to buy groceries. Let me put it very explicitly for the member for North Vancouver in terms of buying the groceries.

This is what the resolution of the gentleman from Lethbridge says in effect in its simplest terms. I will use a little parable.

A family of four has to buy some groceries. I did some checking and found that a family of four on an income of about \$30,000 a year spends about \$7,000 a year on groceries. If they are a fairly typical Canadian family they spend maybe \$600 to \$700 on a mortgage and about \$200 to \$300 on a car.

One day the breadwinner in that family has a bright idea. The light goes on and he calls the family together. He or she, whoever the breadwinner is, calls in the spouse and the two children and says: "I have a bright idea. Do you know what is killing us and why we can never get ahead? We are paying \$600 a month on our mortgage and another couple of hundred dollars on the car loan. But do you know what is really killing us? We are spending \$7,000 a year on groceries. I have a bright idea. We will pay twice as much on the mortgage and not buy any groceries for a whole year. No groceries for a whole year".

We all agree that would bring down the mortgage a lot faster. It certainly would. Just buy no groceries for a whole year and there is an extra \$7,000 to put toward the mortgage or to pay the car loan off.

I see some of the brighter members of the Chamber have twigged to the problem. They are actually asking: "What are those people going to eat for a year?" There is the rub. That is what my friend from North Vancouver had not thought about, what they are going to eat for a year.

As Marie Antoinette said, let them eat cake, but even cake costs money these days. What are they going to eat for that whole year while they are rushing madly to pay down their deficit, their accumulated debt, their mortgage? I think I have made my point that whether it is a family or a nation these things have to be done in balance. Those people who say that all we have to be preoccupied with is deficit elimination to the exclusion of everything else are not just preaching a very naive doctrine, they are misleading a lot of people.

Let us go back to section (a) of the resolution of the gentleman from Lethbridge. Here is his solution. It is the grocery analogy I mentioned a moment ago. It is the same idea under different terms: cut out the groceries, do not buy any groceries for a year.

The hon. member says to place a moratorium on all new spending programs, such as youth service corps which represents 17,500 new jobs. The infrastructure program represents 65,000 new jobs. Residential rehabilitation assistance program represents several thousands of more new jobs.

Let the word go out. At least one member of the Reform Party, the gentleman from Lethbridge says in writing so we have to take the man at his word, would immediately move to aggravate the job situation in this country by another 100,000 jobs.

This budget is about several things.

• (1615)

Yes, it is about deficit reduction but it can never be about that alone. Yes, it is about job creation. The gentleman in his motion has identified three or four particular programs but he identifies them for the purpose of asking us as a House to wipe them out, to wipe out those 100 jobs, and to drive up the unemployment rate another point or two.

As I said before, I respect the other point of view. I have difficulty understanding why it is being advanced. It makes no sense. It is a one-track mind approach. We all know about the mother whose son enlisted in the military. Being a proud mother, she went down to the parade square to watch him on parade the first day. Being an insightful mother, she noticed something in particular. She noticed that when the drums started and the drummer beat out the left, right, left, right, left, right and the several hundreds of men and women went down the parade square, Johnny was the only one in step. Johnny was the only one in step.

We see in editorials across this country such as in Calgary "Martin is headed in the right direction" and in Edmonton "It is solemn and thoughtful and full of well worked out details. There are real spending cuts in this budget". This is what the editorialist says in the *Edmonton Journal*.

From the Canadian Chamber of Commerce we have this: "I think it is a doable budget". I could go to other parts but I have run out of time. I appeal to my friend from Lethbridge not to be Johnny on this one. Get in step with what the people said last fall. Get in step with what the editorialists are saying. Get in step with what the people are saying.

The people are saying that we should bring down the deficit but we should give them some jobs.

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver):** Mr. Speaker, I did enjoy the hon. member's speech, as I always do.

He mentioned the fiscal monitor but the Minister of Finance said in this House that the people of Canada cannot understand the fiscal monitor. We would like to see it put in a form once a quarter so that the people of Canada can actually understand whether the deficit is being addressed or not.