

*Supply*

with American congressmen, congresswomen and constituents who told me their representation was very effective.

Reform is on record for looking at federal funding to multiculturalism and the official languages program. These are just some of the examples where Reform would cut.

We must protect law enforcement, health, education and our environment. We believe we must bring forward alternatives so Canadians can see there is another way other than the Liberal way. We see a need for a fresh, new vision of social policy in the next century, forwarded on the belief that the best guarantee governments can provide of individual personal security is to establish a framework of laws within which individuals can save for or insure against each of the contingencies that life may bring upon them.

We believe in five guiding principles to support our vision of the future. First, build on the Canadian tradition of self-reliance, recognizing the family as the primary caregiver in society.

Second, empower communities and charitable organizations to play an ever increasing rather than a diminishing role in social security.

Third, provide temporary assistance to people who experience short term misfortune while ensuring that long term assistance is reserved for those who are generally incapable of providing for themselves.

• (1235)

Fourth, where government must be involved in social service delivery, entrust the resources and the responsibility to that level of government which is closest to the people.

Fifth, ensure that we can pay for security measures without borrowing more money.

We believe that security must be provided against these types of problems. The first class of security need is for protection against personal catastrophes, such as a medical emergency or the death of a family's chief income earner.

The second class of security need consists of needs that will arise reasonably far into the future but which are predictable. Most people will have such needs at some point in the future. One cannot insure against them but one can prepare for them. Typical needs in this class are post-secondary education, non-catastrophic health care, retirement income and periodic unemployment.

The final class of security need is for intermediate help for those who have not been able to provide for themselves. This is the proper function of charity or, in the absence of it, government transfers.

This is not the cruel and heartless vision of social reform that is attributed to us by the media. It is a system designed to deliver a sufficient level of income to ensure that nobody lives in poverty. Public assistance is to be directed at those who for reasons of physical disability or advanced age are incapable of providing for themselves. At the other end of the scale no one with enough to pay taxes would receive assistance and those who receive assistance would pay no tax.

We must begin to rely on ourselves. We must rely on our families. We can no longer ask the government to provide personal security from the cradle to the grave.

These are some of the ways in which we can achieve a government which is smaller but more effective; spending cuts which eliminate programs that are no longer useful but retain our much needed health care system and our criminal justice system.

I hope the government is listening and will adopt these measures in its upcoming budget.

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to support my hon. colleague's motion urging the government to deal with our budget crisis through spending cuts rather than new tax increases.

I cannot stress enough how important it is to approach budgetary policy from the point of view that government in Canada is too big. There is a very simple reason why government spends too much. It tries to do too much. It tries to do things that it either cannot do at all or that it can do but does very badly.

I brought up this point in discussing Bill C-65. I said then, and I say now, that unless the Liberal government understands where the deficit problem is coming from, it will not be able to solve it. I said that our spending problem comes from our big social programs and that no solution which fails to target them can allow us to deal with our spending problems.

I also said then, as I say now, that we should listen to the Auditor General. We should make sure that when we devise a program we understand clearly what it is supposed to achieve. We should also make sure that we have a clear set of criteria to measure whether or not it has succeeded. We should shut it down if it is not succeeding and shows no signs of succeeding. That applies to the question of how to cut spending. It also applies to the question of whether to cut spending.

Our fundamental objective is to balance the budget. A secondary objective is to balance it at a sufficiently low level. If the government were to balance its books by spending and by taking in taxes three-quarters of the GDP I would not be happy. We should certainly consider whether any budget balancing measures lead to a zero deficit at an acceptably low level of overall spending and taxation. Our main objective is to balance the budget.