

*Income Tax*

breaks and concessions in order for them to accomplish that. They say we have to provide the wherewithal for them to create employment opportunities.

Just a couple of summers ago the government wiped out the Opportunities For Youth program and indicated that it would no longer get involved in the business of creating youth employment but would leave it to the private sector. That summer youth unemployment reached very high levels.

As recently as Tuesday, November 15, in answer to a question in the House, the Prime Minister said that there are measures before parliament in Bill C-11 that will increase productivity, and that somehow or other we have to increase productivity. Also he indicated that tax concessions will have to be given in order to increase productivity, and that jobs will flow as a result of increased productivity. What are these measures which the government indicates will create increased productivity in the country?

The Prime Minister and his cabinet ministers were talking about a \$1.2 billion give-away in Bill C-11, to the corporate sector in order to increase productivity, and the hope is that some jobs will be created as a result of that. The fact of the matter is there is no evidence to indicate that any kind of tax concessions in the past to the private sector created job opportunities to help solve our unemployment crisis.

● (2112)

The government knows very well that over the next ten years the economy must create 2.5 million jobs, and when we put that together with the present 1.5 million unemployed, we must come up with four million jobs over the next ten years. But according to all the estimates of all the experts, the major capital programs that we have going in this country, such as the Athabasca tar sands, the James Bay project, and the pipeline program, can only create about three million jobs. So we will still be short about one million jobs ten years down the road. Has the government developed any kind of economic strategy to deal with the problem? Has it developed any national economic strategy to deal with the economy? Absolutely not.

We on this side of the House, the NDP, have been urging national economic planning for as long as I can remember, since I joined this party and long before I joined it. We say that economic planning must take place in this country. But both Liberal and Conservative members have always looked on economic planning as some sort of communist bugaboo. They think that only communists plan, and the minute you start talking about economic planning, they think you are some sort of communist. They seem to have only one solution to the problem, and that is free enterprise. Indeed they use that term in much the same way that Aladdin used his lamp. They seem to believe that if they repeat the phrase "free enterprise" often enough, somehow or other all the problems in the economy will disappear. But nothing is disappearing; the unemployment problem is not disappearing, and that is a sad fact indeed.

In December of 1975, the Prime Minister in his conversation with Bruce Phillips put his finger on the nub of the

[Mr. Rodriguez.]

problem when he said that the free enterprise system was failing. In effect, he said that the government should involve itself more in the economy. You should have heard the news media, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and the Conservative party react to those words. You would have thought that the heavens were falling when the Prime Minister said that the free enterprise system was failing us. The Prime Minister and his cronies on that side of the House ran for cover when the flack started to come. In effect the Prime Minister got to the nub of the problem, but then he backed away from the solution.

**Mrs. Pigott:** It is the government that has failed us.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Both the government and the official opposition support the free enterprise system, and both are failing the country.

**Mr. Alexander:** That is why you have only 16 seats.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** One always knows when one has touched a sore spot. Here are the defenders of the free enterprise system.

**Mr. Martin:** Would the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) permit a question at this time?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I always welcome questions from the other side. If the hon. member wants to put a question, let him go ahead.

**Mr. Martin:** In view of the hon. member's comments on the free enterprise system—he seems to be condemning both this side and the official opposition for supporting that system—I should like to ask him if he is firmly committed against all forms of free enterprise.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** It is a delight to answer that question, and as I go through my speech this evening I will unfold before the hon. member the socialist alternative.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** The alternative to the laissez-faire free enterprise system.

**An hon. Member:** Skip that speech.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** They can call out all they want, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that they have given every single thing to the private sector. What more can you give? They have given tax concessions, they have given grants, they have given them all sorts of tax breaks, but where are the jobs? Just answer that question.

Now I will present to you the socialist alternative. Here we have in Bill C-11 further give-aways. We have here a \$1.2 billion give-away to the corporate sector. On what analysis of the economy is that based? Is there any strategy, is there a sector by sector analysis of the economy with respect to what is wrong with the mining sector or the manufacturing sector?