

people of Canada in social programs and social services by providing the best of all social programs which is full employment. We will only get full employment if we have financial policies at the national Government level that create the kind of economic atmosphere that will allow the private sector to create that employment.

I beg you, Mr. Speaker, to instruct Members of the New Democratic Party, and try to get it through to them that this is what the people of Canada want. That is what the Parliament of Canada must do. That is what the Government of Canada is trying to implement. It is the will of the people. It is not any political philosophy. We are not burdened with the political philosophy of the New Democratic Party which insists on nationalizing industry and on doing for Canadians what they can do for themselves.

Having completed that comment, Mr. Speaker, I will ask one question. Why does the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River and his colleagues in the New Democratic Party continually refer to programs like the F-18 fighter program and the Patrol Frigate Program as being harmful to Canada and the people of Canada. What is his attitude toward the closure of Chatham Air Force Base? Is he in favour of that? Does he want the people of Chatham in New Brunswick to suffer the pains of unemployment and economic distress because of the closure of that base? Is he and the Members of his Party in favour of that kind of government action? Let us hear his views on national defence?

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Speaker, the sound and fury of the Hon. Member as he came to his point confused me somewhat. I would like to paint a thumb-nail sketch on political science for the Hon. Member.

The reason the people of Canada dumped the previous Liberal Government on its nose was not because of the anal retentive mentality that the Conservative Party has with its fixation on debts and budget problems. I look at the Government of Manitoba and see that it is doing well. The deficit of Saskatchewan was well in hand. They did not have a serious problem until the Conservatives came in and wrecked it.

The dilemma here is that the arrogance and near autocracy of the last Government was so serious that the people of Canada wanted to dump it. It was thrown out because of its absolute unwillingness to listen and to get involved in the kind of dialogue that there should be in the political process.

As a matter of fact, in the last few years the Liberal Party tried to disguise itself as a Conservative Party. I think the Conservative Government of Canada is making a tremendous mistake. These people were thrown out for compromising Canadian sovereignty and the Conservatives are making it worse. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that sad lesson of history is going to be learned by the Conservative Party again. It faces a mandate for constructive change, not the destructive activity that is going on. We will see what happens when their five year period comes to an end. They must get that fixation on debts and deficits off their mind and consider how they can constructively get the country back to work so that people can pay

#### *Bretton Woods Agreements Act*

the way of the country. We will then be on the road. But so far there is no sign that they have learned that lesson. I fear that the country is in further trouble financially, and in terms of its sovereignty.

**Mr. de Jong:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments made by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly). Judging from some of the remarks we have heard on his speech, I feel that the Hon. Member should clarify one or two items.

Would he not agree that the New Democratic Party is also concerned with the deficit, but that it proposes that we should lower the deficit by collecting the revenues that should be collected, which the previous Liberal Government did not collect and which the present Conservative Government certainly is not collecting? If we collected only the deferred taxes owed by the corporate sector we could wipe out most of the deficit of this year. We must deal with the deficit, not by cutting programs but by collecting the taxes which should have been collected in the first place.

The second point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, was that for all intents and purposes democracy is dead in the City of New York. It is dead because decisions of the purse are no longer being made by the City Council of the City of New York. Those decisions are now being made by a group of bankers and financiers who control the expenditures of the City of New York. Surely we begin to lose our sovereignty and political democracy if we allow ourselves to fall into the hands and powers of the financiers. Would my colleague care to comment on the two points I have raised?

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the New Democratic Party has hit the problem on the head. Being from Saskatchewan, he knows that under CCF and NDP governments that province had tremendous years of success in managing the deficit. They managed their deficit better than has any Conservative government. The same thing has occurred in Manitoba.

It will be unfortunate if the Conservatives fail to learn that we need a constructive and moving economy giving people the opportunity to work. We do not need the vision of this country that the Conservatives are perpetrating right now. They are cutting for the sake of cutting and exercising restraint that is harming thousands of people. They are compounding what the small-minded provincial Conservative governments are doing in their jurisdictions. We need an open and fresh approach to the problem.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The period provided for questions and comments has now expired. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. MacLellan).

[*English*]

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-30, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. While the recommendations and changes are mostly