

which has been demonstrated not to work by the fact that we are now ranked twenty-fourth out of 24 OECD nations. That is what I am speaking to.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct and comment on some of the things the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) said. First, I said that the Conservative Party refused to put on record its policies and procedures. I note for the record that the Hon. Member for York-Peel has never been too abashed to do that. We have noted his approach to the problems in El Salvador and Central America, which I would say was in support of the governments in power there and the very nefarious activities going on.

We know that the Hon. Member for York-Peel is on the far right of the Conservative Party. He mentioned three points in terms of expanding the oil industry, but the additional expenditures would be simply the trickle down effect where we pay the companies and the wealthy and hope that it trickles through. He suspects that the freeing up of \$20 billion will get things rolling, but it will simply serve to engorge multinational oil companies in Canada. Speeding up Hibernia and Beaufort Sea explorations cannot be done in the face of declining world oil prices. His proposal to export 100 million barrels of oil will simply deprive Canadians now and in the future of an opportunity of access to light crude. Basically it is an absolutely ridiculous approach to the solution of problems in Canada.

I want to admit that I was mistaken on one matter. The Hon. Member for York-Peel, in a different way than most other Members of the Conservative Party, put on the record proposals which I think would be very seriously looked at in terms of an election.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the comments of the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River which reflect how out of touch he and the New Democratic Party are. The British have spoken today. They have given a massive vote of support for Margaret Thatcher and her Conservative policies in the United Kingdom. There is a wave in the world today in favour of conservatism and diametrically opposed to the socialistic, dogmatic type of approach which perhaps was in vogue in the 1960s. The socialistic approach is out of favour. This is reflected also by the results of today's Gallup poll that showed our friends to my left have now fallen back to a mere 16 per cent of popular support.

I understand how Members of the New Democratic Party feel. They are a little fluttery at the present time as they sense how the world is passing them by. If the Hon. Member wants to see some action in the House, if he wants to see jobs for Canadians, and if he wants to see less inflation and lower interest rates, he will have an opportunity very shortly to allow us to form the new Government after the next election. We will put some truly free enterprise oriented policies back into vogue and allow Canadians to create some prosperity once again without a leechlike Public Service oriented Government living off their backs.

Message from the Senate

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), it sounded very familiar. It sounded like the program which the presidential candidate of the Republican Party, Mr. Reagan, proposed three years ago. The Americans, as they had the right under democracy, accepted his argument. Three years down the road and after the United States Government did the kinds of things the Hon. Member for York-Peel has been advocating, such as cutting taxes to the business community, giving greater incentives and the rest of it, Americans are still faced with over 10 per cent unemployment.

I would like to ask him a specific question. He talked about the deficit. Of course we have a large deficit. A substantial part of it was brought about by the very large increase in transfer payments which the federal Government pays to the Provinces for post-secondary education, hospital insurance and medical insurance. If there is a Conservative Government in the future of which he is a Minister—and that is a very unlikely possibility—and if it is faced with a large deficit, would it cut back on transfer payments, particularly for programs such as hospital insurance, medical insurance, old age pensions and family allowances?

Mr. Stevens: Aren't they beautiful, Mr. Speaker? They always come up with that old bogey that the only way we can get back to prosperity and reduce the deficit in the country is by cutting back their precious spending programs. The fact is that with what I outlined we would not have to cut from the real growth in federal Government expenditures one five-cent piece. All we would do is to put some faith back into the private sector and let it do the job of creating the wealth, which in turn will create the tax revenue we need to start balancing the budget.

If I could comment on one other matter, the Hon. Member referred to the program in the United States. He might be interested in a contrast between what has happened in Canada and what has happened in the United States in the last five years. The real Gross National Product in Canada went up 13 per cent, whereas in the United States it went up 19 per cent, and in every other economic aspect we did worse.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but he can only continue with unanimous consent because his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

* * *

[Translation]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has