

What is the Conservative attitude to job creation? We have it as reported in the *Montreal Gazette* for May 18, 1983. That is from their new Leader:

"Oh, there'll be jobs for Liberals and NDPers too," Mulroney said in New Brunswick recently, "but only after I've been prime minister for 15 years and I can't find a single living, breathing Tory to appoint."

There is the Tory job-creation policy. The Tories talk about patronage. But they will say their Leader was only appealing for votes then, and trying to get elected as leader. I suppose that is the explanation for that. Since we have not heard anything more about the Tory job-creation policy, this is all that stands. I would not call the Tories hypocrites. Of course we do not do that here. But there is something wrong when people at one time can stand in this House and complain about patronage while having on the record at the same time that their job-creation programs will only be for Members of their own Party for a 15 years period. Hopefully we will never get the chance to suffer 15 years of Tory rule. If the Tories do in 15 years what their blood brothers and sisters have done in British Columbia for 29 out of the last 32 years, then this country will be even lower than it is today. It will be well below ground.

I want now to give an idea of just how serious the employment picture is. While we appreciate those programs which have allowed for the creation of some jobs in my area, albeit short-term ones, I want to refer to a few figures to show how serious the situation has been in my constituency. In the area of logging, in the period from 1980 to March 1983 we lost 310 jobs; in manufacturing and processing, 1,019 jobs; in mining, 407 jobs; in construction, 320 jobs; and in the retail and service sector, 350 jobs. None of these figures include staff reductions of businesses still in operation. These are just closures in a constituency which has the smallest population of any constituency in the Province of British Columbia and, as I said, with a 27 per cent unemployment rate today.

● (1730)

There have also been cutbacks by the provincial Government in Victoria in forestry, of all areas, which led to a higher percentage of terminations than in any other area in the province. We are a major forestry region. For some reason the Federal Government, in the same way as it hands out tax incentives and allowances without seeking any guarantees or without any supervision, also handed out funds for education and health to the provincial Government and allowed that gang in Victoria to eliminate an entire educational institution, getting rid of another 100 full-time jobs and the income generated by over 500 students. All these things are happening at once.

Is the Government surprised that we do not sound overly grateful because we have been successful in working with its officials to bring in a relatively large number of short-term job-creation projects?

I have not loaded my speech with statistics. There are many people to do that. The statistics are available. The Government has seen them. It saw them in the Carter report and in

### *Supply*

numerous reports which it commissioned publicly and privately over a number of years. I would like to quote the Chairman of the Bank of Montreal who said:

All industry is awash in tax incentive now. There is so much unused capacity . . . the last thing they are going to want is more capacity.

With a policy like that, surely it is time for members of the Government to realize that by handing out money by the barrel, without insisting upon results and insisting upon receiving value for the money expended, is not accomplishing anything. We must work to ensure that industry builds upon our strengths, not see it wiped out and then spend piddly amounts all over the place, trying to come up with research for new grand visions which we never know will work or not.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Are there any questions or comments? As no one wants to put any questions or make any comments, the Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Bujold) on debate.

[*Translation*]

Order, please. The Hon. Member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Bujold).

**Mr. Rémi Bujold (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate. First, I should like to answer my colleague for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen) who was complaining a moment ago that the Government had abolished advisory committees for the selection of job creation programs. The explanation is very simple, Mr. Speaker: we on this side of the House would sooner allocate those funds to create permanent jobs rather than hire people or give money to some people who in all likelihood would emphasize regional input; our priority was job creation programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal specifically with the third paragraph of the motion introduced today which has to do with the allocation of job creation funds. We have been accused of partisanship. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back a few years and mention briefly the economic problems experienced by all industrialized nations throughout the world, particularly those we had here in Canada. That is one of the factors which make it interesting to follow the gradual increase in the unemployment rate over the past five years. In 1979-80, for example, the Government of Canada set aside some \$330 million for its various job creation programs. We allocated about \$300 million in 1980-81 and about \$340 million in 1981-82 when the economic situation took a turn for the worse throughout the world, particularly so in Canada. Our response in 1982-83 was to earmark close to \$550 million for the many job creation programs all over Canada.

The year 1983-84 was bleaker still with respect to new jobs, lay-offs and severe unemployment throughout the country, so the Canadian Government—the Liberal Government—assumed its responsibilities by appropriating an unprecedented amount of about \$1.5 billion to create jobs for Canadians.