

precisely the kind of thing we must do for the future, yet it is precisely that kind of project which can no longer be funded by IRDP. For example, over \$60 million was given by the federal Government this past year to the new American Motors Corporation plant in the constituency of the Premier of Ontario. Such support will no longer be possible as a result of these changes.

In fact, the cuts for 1985-86 are fully one-third of planned expenditure. In the first nine months of the operation of this program, we find that 381 projects were established. These new rules brought in by the Minister would have cut out 69 of those projects, which amounts to over 41 per cent of total funds. At an average cost per job of some \$9,500 per year, these \$525 million in cuts, therefore, will cost this country 55,000 jobs over the next three years.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, there must be a political alternative to this kind of butchery. The New Democratic Party represents that political alternative, an alternative which aims not to damage the private sector but to provide partnership and leadership to the private sector in the future.

Mr. Nickerson: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democratic Party get its act together. The Leader of the Party is going around condemning the Hon. Member who has just spoken is a plea that the same so-called corporate welfare bums be given more and more money. I just wish, Sir, that those Hon. Members would get their act together and talk with one voice instead of several.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker I suspect it is typical for Hon. Members to pay somewhat less attention than they should to the speeches of new Members. However, I must say that what I was talking about is precisely the kind of approach which we, as a Party, have been advocating. It is an approach which says that any support provided to private sector industries must come with a commitment to certain numbers of jobs.

As the Hon. Member I am sure knows, that is precisely what happens in all Industrial and Regional Development Programs grants. Each company which receives such support must make a detailed commitment to the government of the kinds of jobs to be provided, where they will be and the training which is associated with them.

We have looked at this program and it has received our support and, indeed, it received the support of the Conservative Party as well when the Bill went through the House of Commons in the last Parliament. It would take us into partnership with the private sector, a partnership where we knew we would get results rather than the kind of partnership in some sort of dark paper bag, which happens when you hand out tax write-offs without any guarantee of a return.

● (1200)

In the first nine months of this program, as I stressed, some 35,000 jobs were established by the funding provided. I stress again that 41 per cent of that money could not have been given under the rules the Minister has now brought forward. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I stress to all members of the

The Address—Mr. Langdon

Conservative caucus that my constituency is not affected. Essex-Windsor remains one of those constituencies which will continue to receive grants under this program. But one half of this country, most of it represented by the Conservative Party which previously could see industry getting support for modernization, expansion and restructuring to meet the challenges of the future, will no longer be able to do so. I urge members of the Conservative caucus to make sure that at their next meeting they raise with their leadership the crucial and damaging cuts which are going to hit their people.

I might say the press release which detailed all these changes was given out on a Friday afternoon. When I worked in the Press Gallery we were particularly suspicious of press releases on Friday afternoons, especially before a long weekend. This was because they were Friday afternoon bad news press releases which would be ignored. I urge members of the Conservative caucus to look up the press release, look at the detailed changes in it, and see exactly how damaging to them and their communities these changes actually are. Perhaps then they will join me in some of the criticisms I am making instead of criticizing me.

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member on his maiden speech and welcome him to the House. Obviously he has been here before, I guess sitting in that hallowed position up there in the Press Gallery. I was glad to see that he does agree with us in most areas.

Ms. Mitchell: You were not listening either.

Mr. Gauthier: He does not listen too well, does he?

Mr. St. Germain: I was listening. That is the trouble with you Liberals; you never listen to us and that is why we have the problems we have in this country.

The Hon. Member points out that we have to make changes, and we agree. We made the changes that were required. I do not know the Hon. Member's background from a business point of view, but I think he will have to agree that the problem in this country is that there have been too many grants handed out by that crew over there that sits to his right. They have given the entire country away through grants, but we have brought back a sense of fiscal responsibility.

The reason there are no jobs is that we are suffering from high interest rates brought on by the Liberal Government's deficits. I would like the Hon. Member to address the problem in business, which is high interest rates. It is not a question of shortage of grants, it is a situation where interest rates are so high business cannot expand and create jobs. There is no point getting a 30 per cent grant if you are going to go broke anyway. I would like the Hon. Member to comment on why he does not concentrate on the real problem, that being high interest rates.

Mr. Waddell: We have raised that for a whole year.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I am particularly delighted to have the Hon. Member's support for the NDP's strong fight