

women. We are told that there are women in relatively well-off families that have no other money they can call their own than the family allowances. In the U.S., only 10% of all families are of the classic model where father works and mother stays home to look after the children. More and more women work and earn. Let us not design a policy for the future by anchoring ourselves in the past.

(16) There exists a large percentage of *employable* welfare and unemployment insurance recipients who should work.

(17) Because of this, a public works option is thinkable. Many of the facilities needed are already in place and similar programs are operating out of non-profit, community organization, though on a small scale.

(18) By making use of existing programs and giving them additional funds, many of these desirable outputs could be produced. This would avoid creating another huge bureaucracy and leave the management of the programs to those who are familiar with local needs.

Interview with Steven G. Peitchinis
Economics Department
University of Calgary
February 3, 1986

(1) National output must grow with sufficient increments in order to maintain the production system and to renew this system as well as to maintain those who do not participate in remunerated economic activity.

(2) In Socrates' Greece, the proportion of national output allocated to cultural activities far exceeded ours.

(3) Given economic growth, we *can* maintain full employment.

(4) Austrian view: full employment creates wealth. Neoclassical view: wealth creates employment.

(5) In Canada, investment has lagged due to a withdrawal of foreign investments: we have not invited investment in business, health care, education, transportation. Investment has been limited to resource and manufacturing activities, causing

disproportionate investment, creating the impression that we are dominated by foreign investment. This caused a withdrawal or a slow-down of foreign investments.

(6) The difference between Austria, Sweden and Canada is the Canadian infrastructure which was established by foreign capital. We must maintain this.

(7) This infrastructure was far larger than that which could be maintained with domestic capital.

(8) Inadequate capital investment in this country over the last 15 years explains our drop in productivity.

(9) Investors look at long-term return as associated with degree of risks; Canadian political stability is attractive in the long run. Nationalization is threatening for investors.

(10) Why have Canadians relied so much on foreign capital and ingenuity?

(11) Largely due to industrial links with the U.S.

(12) The market relationship between the U.S. and Canada has been associated with the capacity of the U.S. to enter the Canadian market with lower per unit cost of production (due to increased experience, economies of scale, marketing, research activity and so on).

(13) The common view is that Canadian enterprises cannot compete with the United States.

(14) The inter-industry links are important in the North American context between U.S. and Canadian firms.

(15) In the case of Canadair, many of the parts come from the U.S. due to permanent links with U.S. industry, regardless of alternatives.

(16) This interdependency leads to a decreased level of innovation on the part of Canadian entrepreneurs.

(17) Why not join the U.S. to gain political weight? We could reduce transportation costs at the same time.

(18) A free trade arrangement will be nothing more than a ratification of existing agreements, opening markets for industries which are now established in Canada.