

Finance

has a rather less than positive effect on inflation. The government cannot have it both ways. It has to choose whether it will attempt to make its record on a reduced level of inflation at the cost of keeping more people out of work, or whether employment will be looked upon as the most important objective of public policy at the same time as living with a somewhat higher rate of inflation than it wants.

Hon. members of the New Democratic Party have made a decision. The decision was not easy to make, because something wanted is traded off for something needed. There is nothing more important than putting the 1.5 million unemployed Canadians back to work. A price has to be paid for that and the level of inflation will be somewhat higher. Perhaps the government will have to eat humble pie. That is better than 1½ million people remaining unemployed. The New Democratic Party does not like the idea of the devalued dollar: we would rather see a full dollar and full employment. If the choice is to let the dollar fall in order to create more employment, then we are prepared to do that.

I would like to hear the government suggest something constructive, rather than just saying that everything it does is correct and everything the official opposition does is wrong. There should be an evaluation of the kind of costs; then there can be debate and the people can be asked to assess what they want. They would know the prices they are required to pay and the advantages they would receive. No advantage comes without a disadvantage. The government has been asking the opposition where it stands. In straightforward terms, the New Democratic Party stands for full employment. Whatever has to be done should be done.

Devaluation does not hit everyone the same way: the poor do not consume imported goods to the same extent as the rich. At a time when the country has to make sacrifices to put people back to work, we should be concerned about jobs and how the poor are affected. The poor are not able to buy imported stereos or to take trips to the Caribbean. That is the kind of trade-off the country should be willing to accept.

An hon. Member: What about Canadian travel?

Mr. Saltsman: If public policy encourages Canadian travel, it is a good thing. There is a need for more frankness in this kind of debate. I criticize the government because it wants it both ways. It wants devaluation, it talks about the benefits of devaluation, and then for some reason it decides it will not go through with it. I think that is wrong, and it has not been explained to the country.

● (2322)

Mr. D. M. Collette (York East): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure of me to take part in the debate this evening, but before I get into the subject matter of the motion under Standing Order 26 I should like to make a few remarks directed toward the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) who spoke about an hour or so ago. He launched into one of the most virulent and vitriolic attacks I have heard on an individual member of the House, namely, the Minister of State

[Mr. Saltsman.]

for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mrs. Campagnolo). He criticized her for being a good constituency member. I can tell the House that the hon. member for Don Valley cannot hold a candle to the efforts of the minister.

An hon. Member: Do you want to be her parliamentary secretary?

Mr. Collette: No, Mr. Speaker. I speak as one of the neighbours of the hon. member for Don Valley in metropolitan Toronto. He also ridiculed the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Guay) for being the Liberal member from Manitoba. But he did not look around at metropolitan Toronto to see what happened to the Conservatives in that city when one of his colleagues, one of the only two Conservative members, namely, the hon. member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek), is steering away from Toronto and going to Oakville where they do not want him. Let the hon. member for Don Valley remember the glass house in which he lives before he casts stones at some of the members on this side. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I felt compelled to make these remarks because they came up in the cut and thrust of the debate this evening.

Some hon. Members: Tell us about Sun Life.

Mr. Collette: Our position on Sun Life was morally defensible, I think, and one which did a lot for the cause of national unity in this country. But where was the Conservative party and where was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark)? Anyway, we do not want to get into that this evening.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Collette: What we have here this evening is a debate called by the Progressive Conservatives, and of course the NDP, to boost their sagging popularity, to show their concern, and to get headlines.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Collette: It is true. Look at the Gallup polls. The P.C. party is going nowhere and they are becoming desperate.

I also take exception to some of the remarks of the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent). My colleague, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson), made reference to the fact that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby attended the London School of Economics. He was one of my professors at the university about ten years ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: So that is the connection! Now we know.

Mr. Collette: I did not realize what was wrong with his kind of economics until I came to the House, as was pointed out by some of my colleagues.

Let us talk about the declining dollar and the economic situation in this country which has brought about the decline in the dollar. I believe that the dollar drop should not cause that great an alarm. A 90 cent dollar, as the Minister of