

job creation to try to help the 1.5 million unemployed is \$150 million. At the same time the Government was able to propose tax incentives, particularly for upper-income people through the RRSP formula, which will cost the people of Canada in lost revenue four or five times the \$150 million new money which the Government is prepared to put into job-creation programs.

**Mr. MacLaren:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure from the last two interventions that we do not have a classic example of the difference between the Conservatives and the Socialists or NDP. Our Conservative colleague tells us we are spending far too much. He presumably would want us to cut out some of the social spending. I do not know how else you could sharply reduce the deficit without doing that. On the other hand, our friend from the New Democratic Party says that we are not spending enough, that we should be spending far more, that we should somehow spend our way out of recession.

As usual, the Liberal Party is in the centre, in the right place, in the equilibrium position. What we are doing, of course, is providing on the one hand, as I noted in my speech, substantial support for the unemployed for retraining and direct employment. As I pointed out earlier, we are adding a \$150 million allocation for the Youth Opportunity Fund. That is in addition to the \$1 billion for that fund that we announced in the December Speech from the Throne.

The Member opposite overlooks an essential fact, as our colleagues from the NDP often do, and that is, what we must do to stimulate greater productivity in our country. We are not talking merely about redistribution of income. We are talking about the creation of income. The creation of income will be assisted by the sort of incentives that we put in place for the business sector in the April Budget and in this Budget. The Member opposite must surely be aware that the research and development incentives, the tax carry-forwards—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Order. The question period has now elapsed. We will now resume debate.

**Mr. Fisher:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Members opposite are always asking for more opportunities to raise issues and to question the Minister. He is doing very well now. I might ask the House for unanimous consent to continue asking questions.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** There is not unanimous consent. The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, we really did not learn all that much from the Minister's speech. The exchange in the question period was perhaps a little more productive. It seemed that the Minister was quite apologetic about this Budget. I guess we can sympathize with him. He admitted that the Government does not have the answers to the economic ills that face this country. He admitted, albeit in a roundabout way, that this Government lacks economic lead-

*The Budget—Mr. Mazankowski*

ership. The point has been missed time and again that over the last 15 years this Government really has not changed. Whenever there is a problem, it merely wants to throw money at it in the form of another alphabet soup program. That is really what it expects to do. Rather than providing the incentives and the kind of environment which would be conducive to growth and productivity, it simply creates another government program, put a fancy title to it, and say, "Here, go get it boys". If the Liberal ridings are a little more aggressive, they will get more than their fair share.

● (1740)

What we really need in this country is an admission that we have some very natural strengths. We have built this country on some very basic, natural strengths; agriculture, forestry, fisheries, energy, mining, and a whole host of things. But what has happened is that every one of these industries is in trouble because of the economic policies of this Government. What we need in this country is stimulation of these industries, greater productivity, and the production of more high quality products at lower prices. That way we can generate new health in this country.

We certainly do not argue with the theme which is contained in this Budget. The theme is great, except that there is nothing in the Budget which will help to achieve that kind of feeling of optimism and confidence, nothing which will encourage greater productivity and opportunities for individual Canadians.

The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) delivered what I would consider to be a scathing personal attack on the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He unleashed a litany of insults and innuendo which quite clearly demonstrate, I believe, the lengths to which some Hon. Members will go and the desperate methods they will use in dealing with the integrity of Hon. Members of this House. The Hon. Member also posed as an expert on deficits. He really admitted that he was not an expert on deficits in the federal domain. He talked about the experience he had in the Newfoundland legislative chamber, again attacking the Hon. Member for St. John's West. He refused, Mr. Speaker, in the course of his comments, to deal with the deficit problem we have right here in this country, which emanated essentially from the work of this Government. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if you look at the record you will see that when this Government came into office under its current Leader, we had a gross debt in this country of some \$31 billion. Today, at the end of this fiscal year, the gross debt will be \$190 billion. In terms of net debt, when this Government came into office under its current Leader, there was a net debt in this country of \$17.7 billion. At the end of this fiscal year, March 31, 1984, the net debt in this country will have reached \$150.7 billion. We all know that the percentage of government expenditure is rising very dramatically. As a percentage of GNP, the Government expenditure was something like 21 per cent four years ago. It is now approaching 26 per cent.