

they have been driving that one right out to the big green monster. They have been hitting that one so badly that he had to come forward a couple of weeks ago and say: "Sorry, folks, my deficit estimate for this year's budget was off by \$1.5 billion."

His curve ball, tax reform, we know what happened to that one. He managed to get it past the batter the first time up. He said this is phase one, and he squeaked it past and lowered taxes for a few groups of people; but the next time he threw it he thought he was throwing a curve ball—it was actually a spit-ball and called the GST—and he cannot get it past the batter. In fact the last we saw it was a wild pitch and it had rolled back to the back stop behind the catcher. I think it is clear that it is time that the pitcher comes out.

Now the catcher they have got is a solid guy. He maintains pretty consistently what pitch it is he wants thrown to him. He gives the same signal every time to the pitcher. He wants high interest rates. That is the pitch he calls for. So far most of the pitches have been pretty high in the strike zone. Lately they have been starting to come down, but it has not been working anyway.

What we have here, if I can put my analogy aside for a second, is a situation in which in the words of this motion some of the key things we ought to be looking for from our policy makers in government have been abandoned. We should be looking for full employment. We should be looking for international competitiveness. We should be looking for sustainable development. Instead what we have been getting is a steady diet of deficit reduction and high interest rates, an attempt to bring inflation down to zero. Now those pitches have been getting hit. It is not working.

Let me just talk for a second about full employment. Clearly this is not one of the objectives that this government is pursuing. Employment policies have really been one of saying we will sacrifice employment on the altar of low inflation. We are going to try to bring inflation down by literally creating unemployment, so we have this month's employment figures. We are now at an unemployment rate of 8.4 per cent. The rate has been going up steadily since April of this year. It was 7.2 per cent. There has been an increase in unemployed individ-

uals. The rate was 987,000 unemployed in Canada in April of this year. Now it is at 1,150,000.

• (1730)

The government likes to talk about efficiency. It likes to talk about how it wants the economy to operate more efficiently. Mr. Speaker, I challenge you to think of anything that is more inefficient than creating that many new unemployed individuals in Canada because every one of those unemployed individuals represents somebody else who is disheartened, losing out, maybe collecting unemployment insurance, welfare or social assistance, is not earning money to pay taxes, is not producing goods and services, is not helping the Canadian economy operate efficiently. Surely to goodness in this day and age, we should recognize that a policy of forced unemployment is one of the most disheartening, inhumane policies that a government can pursue.

We used to think we knew what full employment meant. We thought it meant that if you wanted a job, you could get a job. Now they are talking about about full employment meaning something they refer to as NEIRU, the non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment. In other words, what level of unemployment are we going to live with in Canada just to keep the rate of inflation down.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for a new pitcher to get into the game and start throwing a good, clean, fastball for full employment and stop throwing this high interest rate ball that is getting nowhere but put out.

What about international competitiveness? This is something that has been of great concern to a lot of us for some time, but when we look at the figures we see that if you consider competitiveness in the context of the necessary investment in science and technology, the government has not been attempting in a serious way to achieve an increase in our scientific research and development in such a way that it will create our competitiveness. We still rank, according to so many indicators, well behind other countries in the world.

If you compare us, for example, to the U.S., Germany, France, U.K., The Netherlands and Japan, our gross expenditure on R and D as a percentage of GDP, Gross Domestic Product, is the lowest. Our industry-funded R and D as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product is the