

Why not also collect these hundreds of millions? Why not accept to review each departmental budget item? We could easily save, not just hundreds of millions, but a few billion dollars which could pay for the infrastructure program without increasing the deficit?

I am surprised that the hon. member only mentions the costs and benefits of the infrastructure program. She is not looking for ways, however easy, to get money from those who have it, namely the rich, the multinational corporations in particular, who benefit from an overly permissive policy.

One last point. Canada's foreign policy should be reviewed. Take the Canadian embassy in Tokyo for example. We all know that the market value of the lot across from it, which is vacant, is \$2 billion and that there are potential buyers prepared to pay \$2 billion for a piece of land next to our embassy. Why not?

**Mrs. Catterall:** Mr. Speaker, I find it the hon. member's comments rather mean. He knows full well that these things are not included in the government's budget. It is very nasty of him to say things like that to Canadians, when he knows the truth. For example, the infrastructure program is but one phase of our economic strategy, which also includes investments in science and technology, as well as measures to help small businesses create employment.

• (1605)

The hon. member also knows that we have launched a project to review, as he mentioned, each government budget item, in order to identify what needs to be done to implement effective programs.

He knows as well that our budget includes many measures to eliminate the tax shelters he complained about. I do not object to hearing dissenting opinions in this House but, for the sake of our fellow Canadians, we must be honest.

[English]

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few words on what is at the very least a fairly interesting motion. The motion says in part that the budget plan of the government is not the solution to Canada's debt and deficit problem.

I will come back to that in a few moments but I would like to go to some other parts of the motion. I would have thought the gentleman from Lethbridge with his long experience would have known better than to incorporate things in a motion which are already in effect or have been done.

The member for North Vancouver can laugh. Let me refer him to section (c) of the resolution and let us see if he will laugh. I

### Supply

mention him for the very particular reason that his constituents will know he is identifying with the blatant falsehood contained in section (c).

The falsehood is it calls on the House and the government to produce quarterly reports on the progress being made on deficit reduction. I ask the laughing, much amused member for North Vancouver: As a member of this House and as a Canadian who, if we listen to his rhetoric, is very concerned about the deficit, does he not know there is a document produced regularly? It is "The Fiscal Monitor" put out by the Department of Finance. It reports not just quarterly as called for by the motion, but monthly.

**Mr. White (North Vancouver):** The finance minister said the people of Canada cannot understand it.

**Mr. Simmons:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure in time you will have the charity to allow my friend from North Vancouver to say his few words. When he does rise I hope he will realize that something which is blatantly false cannot be embodied in a resolution. It is blatantly false.

He changes his tune now. He says, yes it is there but they cannot understand it. Well, that is a different issue. Had his friend from Lethbridge said to produce something that is understandable, but that is not what he said. By implication he gave the impression to the people of Canada and particularly to this House that the progress report is not happening. I say to him it is happening on a regular basis in a document called "The Fiscal Monitor".

I am glad for this resolution and glad for this opportunity. It puts into focus two fundamentally differing views on the role of government.

On the one hand there is this punitive philosophy underlying the opposition motion. It says that government has little to offer the economy, that government by its very nature cannot help the jobless. That is not a perspective I subscribe to. It is a perspective I can understand. I do not endorse it but I can respect it. I can respect the gentleman from Lethbridge for having that point of view. That perspective mixes the worst aspects of do nothing corporatism with the slash and trash public posturing of which my friend from Ottawa West talked about a few moments ago.

More to the point, the philosophy which underlies this resolution is the very philosophy the people of Canada rejected outright last fall. It is the philosophy the Tories paraded in this Chamber for a decade and you know what happened to them. If you are not sure, have you heard about the Dodo bird? They both went the same way and for the same reason: They were out of tune with the times. This slash and burn philosophy has been rejected outright by Canadians.