

*Supply*

we permit some leeway, give some inducements and give some incentives to our great industrial giants. We must step back and permit the market to work.

Government must get out of the marketplace. You cannot just interfere a little bit. Whenever you step in and bail out one company, you are creating distortions in the marketplace, and all the other companies find that to be unfair competition. You then have to bail out all the industries. We are going down a very slippery slope from which there is no longer any return, at least as long as the Government is in power supported by this little red rump over here. Obviously, they think all you have to do is to concentrate all the power in a central place, whether government, regulatory or corporate power of these great corporate entities, which buy, sell, switch and flip and have managed to insulate themselves totally from any of the market forces.

Whenever they get in trouble, and particularly if the banks tell them they are in trouble, they come running to government. They tell the government it has to bail them out. When they say that, they mean bail out the banks. They do not really mean bail out the workers or the company. Maislin trucking was an example of that. The bailout was not that of the workers or small contractors who were working for Maislin trucking. The bank was bailed out and then it pulled the plug and let everybody go down the chute. Nobody had any compassion for the small businessman or the worker. The compassion was for the bank. The bank had told Maislin to go to the Government and tell it to bail it out because if it did not, it would be an incredible political liability because all those people would be unemployed. The same is true for Dome Petroleum and all these other great bailouts we have been involved in.

The fact is that you cannot bail out a little bit, just as you cannot be pregnant a little bit. Once it starts, it keeps growing. It is like a cancer and it destroys our system. It is time to stop this cancerous growth. It is time that we started rebuilding the foundation of our system, get government out of the marketplace, and assign a lesser social burden.

I touched on taxes a little when I spoke about the mine in the riding of my friend from Skeena. Thirty-five per cent of the capital requirements to get that mine onstream had to do with the social structure. When you talk about taxes, think about the non-profit taxes that companies have to pay; fuel, municipal, regional and provincial taxes. All of these have escalated out of all proportion. The operating costs of many resource centres throughout Canada are now in the range of 25 to 30 per cent a year in terms of non-profit taxes. That is incredible. We have to turn that around. Instead of imposing more taxes on our corporations we must lessen the load, relieve them of this incredible social burden, and relieve them of the Government and that little red rump over there.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question for the Member for Prince George-Peace River, (Mr. Oberle). I will not reflect too long on the twisted distortions of fact the Hon. Member presented. I suppose some people in his constituency believe it. From time to time I pass his speeches around

in my constituency because everybody gets a good laugh. The Hon. Member obviously does not know what he is talking about, although sometimes outside of the House one would think he does.

While the Hon. Member was in Government his Government decided to cut off all job creation funds. That is one of the things we are talking about today. Would he comment on how effective that is as a policy in terms of the kind of projects we are talking about today? He talks about the Government across the way giving money to Malaysia to set up a pulp mill and gives money to Chile to set up a copper mine. I have taken the time to write to External Affairs. I have all the figures. I know the figures were higher in 1979 under the Government of which that Member was a part than they have been from 1980 to 1984 with the Government sitting across the floor. The Tory Government put more money than the Liberals into opening mines in other areas of the world, in direct competition with Canadian Mines. In terms of forestry projects it gave money to South American dictatorships and to Indonesian dictatorships for forestry projects that do not occur in Canada. The Member claims to know a great deal about forestry; nevertheless that is what occurred.

Is the Minister telling the Canadian public that the Schefferville experience is really the way things should be handled? Is he saying that when mines close there is no responsibility of government and no responsibility of the companies? Is Schefferville really the motto of the Tory Party?

**Mr. Oberle:** Mr. Speaker, talk about humour. You cannot call this Member a bare faced liar because he wears a beard. He is certainly a stranger to the truth when he talks about the policies of the Clark Government in 1979. I talked about the fact that we really have given up our options. There are no options left. The industries have no money to expand. We have destroyed their markets. We have two million people unemployed, half of them under the age of 24. What else can you do but rely on short-term job creation programs such as the Government has done for the last five or six years?

In a few months the Hon. Member may be able to call me Mr. Minister. When he does, I will probably tell him that for some time to come, to bridge this gap and to restore the entrepreneurial spirit and the foundation on which our industry and economy rest, we will probably have to continue to have some job-creation programs and some innovative programs that small business, the real job creators, could respond to. They will not create a two-month job that can be counted on to end up with 400,000 jobs four times a year in one year, all of them recycled four times. The Government has created more jobs in the last five years than we have population. It recycles these jobs three or four times a year.

The New Democratic Party supported the Members over there in February of 1980 in defeating the Progressive Conservative Budget. That Budget had very real incentives to save the farmers and fishermen in the Hon. Member's constituency. Members opposite have decided to live with the evil over there by defeating the Progressive Conservative Party. We will probably have to continue some of these programs. However, it