

*Supply*

waste, either from the training point of view or the point of view of their earning money and helping the community at large, with the procurement program and the spin-off effects in the local community, because we are talking not only of presently existing bases; we are talking of probably 177 locations throughout Canada. Just think of that. Would that be a waste of money? But, unfortunately, when we come down to the cost factor, we have been told it would be an expensive program. And yes, in comparison with other programs, it would be expensive, until you think of the effect of getting immediately back into the Treasury the statutory contributions and other effects. However, if the Government were to accept not only this proposal but others—this flows from the question which the Parliamentary Secretary put to the Hon. Member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson)—I wonder if the Tory Party, for one, would accept the idea of an increased deficit. Certainly from the answers and ambivalence we perceive in the Tory caucus, I am not sure.

● (1630)

We have been told in the past that deficits are the curse of present day society, depending on which economist you are following. I think what would spook me is not so much a higher deficit, but the continuing long unemployment of the people of Canada. In yesterday's *Toronto Star* we were told that industry, not the socialist Party or even some left-wing members of the Liberal Party, urges "billions for jobs". Even industry itself is no longer spooked by the thought of an increased deficit. I am not necessarily advocating a huge deficit; I would like it to be manageable. But if at the expense of increasing the deficit we can give hope to the unemployed people of Canada, certainly I am not going to object to that. However, I wonder what the Tory critics will say to that, people like the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) or the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), the Member who has just spoken, or the Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). I wonder if they could withstand the shock of yet another increased deficit. We will never know.

We have heard Members of the Official Opposition talk about Government intervention. They think it is a dreadful thing. We have been told on several occasions, that businessmen think that Government intervention is a dreadful thing. Then how come it was the businessmen themselves who asked the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) to go to the Pacific Rim countries? That is what I do not understand. Do they want Government intervention or not? If they do, how much do they want? How much intervention do they want in the job creation field? Will they accept a higher deficit? If so, by how much?

So far I have spoken of the Tory Party, but even the Leader of the NDP—again if media reports are correct—even he got squeamish at one stage about an increased deficit. So what is Government to do? Are we to be scared that if we do increase the deficit, the Tories will have a collective heart attack, or that the NDP will start having qualms? We do not know, but these are the kinds of questions that have to be asked.

The Tories talk about investment to create jobs, Mr. Speaker. Of course we on this side of the House would dearly wish to create a better climate for investment which would create jobs. But let us ask ourselves, is there enough money in Canada at the moment—even if it were all invested—to create all the jobs we need? I am not sure that the answer to that could possibly be yes. In fact, I am pretty sure it would have to be no, there is not enough money. So where do we get the investment money from? From overseas. Even today, in the midst of the unemployment crisis in Canada, in the midst of the sorrow which each and every one of us as Members of Parliament witness every week in our constituencies, with unemployed constituents, even with all that, there was a question today in the House from a Member of the NDP asking if the Government was going soft on FIRA. Here again we have to ask ourselves another question. On the one hand, we want investment in Canada to create jobs in Canada. On the other hand, we want an institution which is so tight that it frightens the daylighters out of potential investors in this country. We cannot have it both ways. Perhaps that should be the sum total of this debate, Mr. Speaker. Because we cannot have it both ways, we have to get together in the spirit of co-operation, starting in this House, and talk about the realities of the situation, what can be done, and stop all this petty, petty bickering.

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, first I should like to make a few comments on this idea of consensus and co-operation. The last speaker referred to this and said we should stop arguing amongst ourselves, that we should all co-operate. Everyone has spoken in favour of consensus, but what each individual means when he uses those words is that everyone should come around to his particular way of thinking, then we can solve all the problems. Well, Mr. Speaker, I really do not think that can happen. I do not know that it should happen. I think there always has to be room for dissent. The majority view, by and large, should prevail, but there should be room for dissent. The consensus by way of majority view will come about after the time of our next election. I have every expectation that there will be returned to this House a large majority Conservative Government after the next election. But there will still be room for dissent. There will be a handful of Liberal and NDP Members returned, of that I have no doubt. There might even be a dozen of them. I would not necessarily expect a high degree of co-operation from them. They will then be the voice of dissent and they will have every right to be heard. That is how majority consensus should operate.

I see by the consensus of Members here today that my time has been reduced from some 20 minutes to ten minutes. Therefore, what I will do is to give you a preview of a great speech I had intended to give, and probably will give at some future date. It had not been my intention to get into a great partisan debate, although the motion is phrased in a very condemnatory manner. I do not think it is necessary for me to condemn the Government; it has done that itself by its own actions and inaction. What I wanted to do was to look into the