

Supply

The Liberals would not abrogate the free trade agreement. God knows what they would do with NAFTA. We would abrogate and we would introduce initiatives to create jobs.

• (1650)

The result is that the deficit over the period of a New Democratic government will be all but eliminated. The deficit will be eliminated and then we can begin to work on the cutting back of the debt.

What does this program involve? First of all it involves an infrastructure program that will prepare our nation with the grounds and the means of transportation, the electronic highway, and the scientific and educational infrastructure that we need. It will create 130,000 jobs immediately and prepare the way for subsequent economic development.

We propose a national investment fund which would encourage small and medium sized businesses, new businesses, to get off the ground. We project that would create 200,000 new jobs.

We propose a national child care program. It is part of our initiative from day care to doctorates to provide training and education for Canadian workers. That would create 70,000 jobs.

We would establish a national council on education to make our educational programs throughout the nation more in accord with our economic goals and to ensure equity and real accomplishment by students in the work place. In order to fund training in industry we would have a grant levy system to pay for it.

We would increase research and development, double IRAP funding, increase funding for the granting councils and find better methods than are presently used now to encourage industry to do research and development in house.

We would undertake initiatives to ensure that our natural resources are processed here to produce jobs in Canada rather than elsewhere.

By doing this the problem of the deficit would be addressed in the only way it can be addressed. That is by putting people back to work. We would create a country in which the government once more has the capacity and will to ensure that we have a sense of community in which we understand as Canadians that government is the means by which we express our responsibility to another. We propose to give people not a hand out but a hand up. That is how the deficit would be addressed, not

on the backs of the unemployed but by creating employment.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member on an excellent speech and the fact that he actually dealt with the deficit in a way in which the country could live with. It is a way of putting people back to work in order to tackle that deficit. He has dealt with both problems, unemployment and the deficit, in a passionate way as he usually does.

I want to make a couple of comments and I want to ask him a question. The member who spoke previously quoted an article in the paper today about a Mr. Dodge, who is now a deputy minister of finance. Mr. Dodge goes on in the letter to say that the taxpayers are on the edge of a revolt and they do not want to be taxed any more. He wrote that even though Mr. Dodge made a lot of the taxes they are going to revolt against.

He goes on to talk about the Bank of Canada. He says that despite the pessimistic predictions, the Canadian economy in 1988 grew very strongly. The bank kept the screws on. The bank kept its monetary policy and high interest rates and kept going. He said that even for 1989. Then he says: "The banks squeezed harder but the reaction in the form of slowing in the wages and prices really did not show up until 1991". He was talking about southern Ontario.

Then he says, and this is the understatement of the decade: "We did make some mistakes, all of us, and that caused the adjustments problem". The adjustments problem meaning 12 per cent unemployment, 20 per cent or 25 per cent unemployment among young people, poverty, hardship, a growing deficit, Canada being rolled toward the position of a Third World country and recession in the country. It is an adjustment problem.

This is the kind of thing we face in dealing with the banks.

• (1655)

The second point I want to make, and the hon. member for Windsor said this, is that the Liberals were part of the problem. I was here in the early eighties when the Liberals had a National Energy Program. In committee I learned they gave out \$13 billion, in 1970s money, in the form of PIP grants, petroleum incentive grants, on the Canada lands and in Alberta. For \$13 billion in grants to oil companies they only took one tanker out of the north. It seems to me the origin of our national debt was the Liberal regime of the period. That was where it started getting out of hand.