**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** How have the Liberals responded to this crisis? How have the Liberals responded to being locked into Reaganomics? Have the Liberals met the challenge by honestly saying that now is the time for an industrial strategy, the kind that my party has called for in the last two elections and about which Herb Gray has talked? Not at all. Herb Gray has been replaced by that omniscient senator in the other place, Senator Olson.

Instead of moving in the right direction to get more Canadian control over our manufacturing sector, instead of establishing an economy less reliant for its balance of payments situation on export resources, the Government of Canada is moving in the opposite direction.

To quote Senator Olson—and this is a complete give-away—he said: "When a country comes to you and they are looking for iron ore, you do not try to sell that country steel." Just a matter of days ago he said: "Canadians should not feel bad about being regarded as hewers of wood and drawers of water." I say it is the Liberal Party of Canada that should feel bad about foisting that kind of policy on the people of Canada.

What is the government doing to deal with the present economic crisis? I have just said that the government is not making that shift. I suggested that Senator Olson's direction is different. It certainly is. The Liberals have adopted a new tack. It is no longer merely resources that they are going to sell off; they are promoting megaprojects in the resource sector. That is the new con job. The Liberals are now saying that megaprojects all across our country will get us out of our balance of payments situation and will create jobs. That is the new path to a rich and brighter future.

That is simply wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is a more up-to-date version, a slicker use of terminology, to try to convince the people that megaprojects mean something different from resource sell-offs. But I say to the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) that he will not get away with that kind of approach any more than Sterling Lyon got away with that approach in the province of Manitoba.

I also say to the Prime Minister, who has said that he does not want and does not believe in a quick-fix solution, that that is precisely the Liberals' approach to the megaprojects. The megaprojects are to be the quick-fix solution to our balance of payments problem. The quick-fix solutions to the problems of Canada would be to get rid of the Liberal Government of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** We in this party say that now is the time, instead of doing what the official opposition has done and trot out the problems, which we have done in past debates as well, to move in new directions. Now is the time to speak frankly to the people of our land. Now is the time to begin the serious march to recovery that Canadians want and deserve. Now is the time to get rid of the Liberal Government of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** I want to make one point with particular emphasis and add two or three comments. I have talked about some of the latter points before. When we say that the manufacturing approach is the key, we say it is the key because it has been the key for Scandinavia, West Germany, France, for Japan, and indeed has been the key for success for the development of the United States of America. I as a Canadian who came of age after World War II feel ashamed of Canadian governments which have not had the courage and determination to make this country into the first-rate industrial nation that it ought to be in 1982.

● (1440)

So, Mr. Speaker, we are saying that in addition to the tax cut proposals we have made before of $1 billion for middle and low-income earners to provide some stimulus to the economy and produce jobs, and in addition to the proposals we made to stimulate particularly the housing sector by taxing the banks at a reasonable level, we are now saying that the multinationals who have done very well in Canada and, as a 1973 U.S. Senate study clearly demonstrates, they are here as in other countries precisely because we have a lucrative market—they are not here for our good, they are here for theirs—are getting all the benefits out of this arrangement and not the people of Canada, since we have a $23 billion deficit in manufactured goods. It is time to turn those priorities around.

We are saying that a serious move at this time of economic crisis by the Government of Canada would be to embark on an industrial strategy and say to the multinationals that they must enter into letters of agreement with the government, as has been done in other industrialized nations, committing themselves to a dollar-value production commensurate with the level of consumption of their products in this country. That means that companies, whether in the automotive sector, the electronics sector or communications—you name it—which happen to be multinationals located here could still have world-scale production, but it would also mean that they would start now to put Canadians to work in numbers equivalent to their dollar benefit in this country. With 1.8 million Canadians unemployed, we think that kind of step is long overdue.

A related point, Mr. Speaker, is that not only do we have to move in terms of manufacturing goods here and maximize our own production for domestic markets—and two places to begin producing thousands of jobs in the next couple of years are in the machinery goods industry and transportation industry, but I will not elaborate on that today. There are also sectors where we could start now which would have important consequences soon.

In addition we in this party are saying, as social democratic parties have said and demonstrated elsewhere in the world, that it is not sufficient to gain control and dominance in your own domestic market; you have to pursue international markets. I have visited countries in western Europe and the Caribbean recently where I was told horror stories about the failure of Canadians to sell goods. I will not name them, but two products were identified which would have produced