

The Address

constituents objected, there would be howls and cries from their constituents and they would want to change their minds.

• (1345)

In my view we have an obligation as a party to support the principles and policies we were elected on. Our policies were clear. Our policies were set forth in the red book. I know it is much talked about, and some laugh at it, but the fact is that it was the only major policy document issued by any political party in the campaign that comprehensively dealt with the issues. It was the benchmark by which every other party's platform was measured. I can safely say, given the numbers in the House, that it was clearly the best. None of the others measured up anywhere near to the standard set by the red book.

We have that set of policies that will guide the government in its work. We have heard speeches from many of the ministers in the course of this six-day debate. They have all spelled out in detail other policies that were given in sketch form in the red book. Those have been made manifest in the House and indeed to the country.

Members of the opposition say they want details. I suggest the details have been provided. The budget will provide further detail.

This is a government on the move. It has established its priorities. It has made its commitments and it is living up to them. I am very pleased to be a part of it and to support it.

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I begin by sincerely thanking the hon. member for so lucidly explaining to us our duties and obligations to our constituents as if we really did not understand them at all.

With respect to his thesis on the relationship between taxation and jobs I would respectfully submit that if governments could create jobs and if raising taxes and increased government revenue would create jobs, his university student with two degrees would have two jobs.

We have had 20 years of wildcat government spending, attempts by governments to manage the economy and to give jobs to people where there were no jobs to be had. It is time to discard this old and discredited philosophy and realize that we cannot continue to selectively bleed portions of the corpse of our country to bring in more and more revenue until we finally finish off everything.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia for his comment. I felt it was time to give him a lecture on his duty to his constituents because almost daily we get a similar lecture from members of his party. I thought it was time to correct the

imbalance and perhaps give a more accurate statement of those principles.

However, that aside, I also suggest to him that the matter of revenue is not the only issue involved in deficit reduction. I am sure he would agree with me when I say that if more people are working government revenues increase. When a person goes back to work who was previously either drawing unemployment insurance or welfare, the person starts paying taxes again which increases government revenue. At the same time the person stops drawing unemployment insurance or welfare which decreases government expenditure. That helps bring about a fiscal balance between revenue and expenditure on the government side.

We stated throughout the campaign that our aim as a party was to create jobs so that Canadians who were costing the government money start paying the government money. We would then achieve a greater balance. It is quite simple. It is simply a matter of ensuring that it happens. It does not all have to happen by lavish expenditure of public funds. There are other ways of achieving it. Encouragement and inducements can be given to people in business to hire people. Inducement can be given to small business, which is our principal job creator, to hire people.

• (1350)

If these things happen and Canadians start spending their money and buying more consumer goods then more people will be employed. It follows as night follows the day. If more are employed then more pay taxes and fewer draw from the government treasury in other expenses.

That is how one brings about fiscal balance. We can cut and chop until the cows come home but every time one cuts and chops without doing something to get people to work then one throws more people out of work. If that keeps happening then there are fewer and fewer paying taxes so how do we get the revenue?

There is something that has never been costed in the package of the Reform Party. I challenged the candidate in Kingston to come up with this but of course Reform does not want to because it would be so damaging to their case. Can they tell us how many jobs will be lost because of the cuts they are proposing? That has never been explained. How much revenue would the government lose with the cuts they are proposing? That has never been explained.

If that revenue is taken off, the deficit stays big. The chops will not reduce the deficit. It will grow under those changes. That is the problem with the Reform agenda and the Canadian people saw through it and they voted this party into office. That is why the Reform Party is sitting on that side of the House. Their agenda frankly was unbelievable.