

and so on. If we do those projects now we can give an immediate injection of job creation with economic benefits later on. It may mean there will not be so much money to spend on these kinds of projects three or four years from now; if we spend the money now, obviously we will not need them later because they will already be onstream. However, the economic benefits will flow from them. They will improve transportation, fisheries or whatever.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Are there any further questions or comments? Debate.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): I am pleased to be able to speak in this debate on Atlantic Canada. I live 5,000 miles away, I suppose, from the beginnings of Atlantic Canada, yet I have listened today with great interest to some good speeches that have been made in the House. I have listened to some of the comments and questions. I think we have a lot to learn from Atlantic Canada; I know I have learned a few things today.

I want to read the motion again just in case some people have forgotten it. The wording is quite interesting. It reads:

That this House recognizes the need for long-term solutions—

I just want to emphasize the words “long-term solutions”. The motion continues:

—to the economic difficulties facing Atlantic Canada and, although welcoming the injection of funds provided under the Special Recovery Program, rejects the manner in which those funds are being allocated, particularly the decision to use partisan advantage—

I underline the words “partisan advantage”. The motion continues:

—rather than need as the basis for the provision of funding, and condemns the government for its failure to adopt policies which would create lasting economic growth with permanent jobs and investment in Atlantic Canada.

When I read that motion I smiled to myself, especially at the words “partisan advantage”. Here are the Conservatives giving it to the Liberal Government for using patronage in Atlantic Canada.

An Hon. Member: It sounds like the NDP.

Mr. Waddell: It is sort of like the pot calling the kettle black.

The last time I was in Atlantic Canada was during the Nova Scotia provincial election. A couple of days before the election I was being driven down the street and the roads were all being paved. It was even warm under the car. I said to my host this was excellent. I asked if this were done all the time. My host replied: “No, only around election time”. If you want to talk about patronage, you have to blame both old line Parties.

Mr. Pepin: Watch your halo.

Mr. Waddell: The Minister is suggesting that I should watch my halo to see that it won't slip. I will try to refrain, because it has slipped lots of times before, from being holier than thou. I would only be human—and I say this to the Minister—if I did not point out that we in the NDP get people criticizing us. They say: “If you get in power, maybe there will

Supply

not be economic growth. The Conservatives and the Liberals are Parties of economic growth.”

I have always thought of that as a nonsense argument, but all you have to do is look at Atlantic Canada. For the last 100 years there has been a chronic recession. You cannot blame the NDP for that because we have not been in Government in Atlantic Canada. The Grits and the Tories have had the power, the old line Parties. The people there have received the same kind of nonsense from both old line Parties. The people have received excuses and poor government for that period. I know there are other factors, but poor government and excuses have contributed to chronic recession.

• (1630)

When I look at the words “Special Recovery Program” in the motion before the House—and I have not had time to research it—I wonder how many such programs there have been in Atlantic Canada. In my lifetime there have been hundreds of special recovery programs to pick up the economy and suddenly make it work. The motion applauds the Special Recovery Program and worries about partisan advantage. In essence it suggests really more of the same. It talks about long-term solutions but does not really specify what those solutions are. It is really bits and pieces, the same kinds of hand-outs which Atlantic Canada has been getting for years.

I have to walk delicately here because it is not up to me as a British Columbia Member to tell people in Atlantic Canada what is good for them, unlike what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said in the House today. He is prepared to tell western farmers what is good for them and that they will benefit, whether or not they like it, from changes in the Crow rate. Surely that is nonsense. It would be inconsistent of me to suggest that I have all the answers to the problems in Atlantic Canada or to tell Atlantic Canadians what is good for them.

I would like to indicate what we in the New Democratic Party can do and have done. First I will indicate one specific example and then I will talk about the general problem affecting Atlantic Canada, indeed all of Canada. I and other Members of the NDP have been active in the regional economic expansion committee in examining the work of Devco, the Cape Breton Development Corporation, which is responsible for coal and various aspects of coal development in that area. I have been in touch with a former Member of the House, Father Andy Hogan, who used to be the Member of Parliament from Cape Breton.

Mr. McCain: They knew better than to elect him again.

Mr. Waddell: The Hon. Member should not worry because he will be back after the next election. He continues to have an interest in the area. I would like to tell the Hon. Member about one area on which we have been working, which I am sure he will support. The Devco officials appeared before the committee, at which point we asked them whether they were receiving many job applications. I am not sure whether the figures are correct, but they said that something like 14,000 people had applied for jobs and that they just could not provide