

Supply

changed his mind. That committee said that one of the important objectives of the federal government should be to encourage young people to develop higher skills and that we should make our programs more widely known.

As a responsible minister, I took that advice. We provided the programs and now he is against them. I guess it amounts to a matter of what they recommend on Tuesday they forget on Thursday. They have no consistency.

Let me examine the positions put forward by the hon. member for Lethbridge-Foothills on behalf of his party. What he is saying, basically, is that they should do nothing—cut back government expenditures, cut back everything, have no government intervention, do nothing, stand still and shrink the budget. That is what he was saying but now he denies it. If he denies it, that means he is contradicting what he said before. Now we are more confused than ever about the position of the Conservative Party. What he said initially he now says forget; he wants to say something else. Perhaps he wants to correct himself and say we should expand government programs and put more money into projects. I suppose we have to conclude that the Conservative Party does not really know where it stands.

Now let me come to the contribution of the New Democratic Party. I compliment the hon. member for Winnipeg-St. James on his fine reading of the article in *The Globe and Mail*. He repeated word for word the article in what he called that "objective journal of opinion". That is a contradiction in itself. I was very pleased to hear what *The Globe and Mail* had to offer but I was curious to hear what the hon. member for Winnipeg-St. James might have to offer. But there was nothing—the cupboard was bare.

When we got down to the hard reality of what the New Democratic Party would propose in order to deal with the issue of unemployment among young people, all we heard was: "Let's have a new industrial strategy; let's spend more money; let's stimulate and restrain at the same time". That is a fine set of resolutions to come from a party which steeped itself in trying to develop the image of what they think is the intellectual, political, leading edge of Canada. We heard about a new industrial strategy. No content, no details, no fine tuning except a large rendition from *The Globe and Mail* and then some very vague suggestions that we have a new industrial strategy.

Mr. Paproski: They are waiting for Dennis McDermott.

Mr. Axworthy: I guess they have not received their marching orders because the convention is not yet over. We will have to wait until next Thursday to find out what the NDP is thinking.

Mr. de Jong: You are getting boring, boring, boring.

Mr. Axworthy: Nothing could be more boring than having to listen to a reading from *The Globe and Mail* for the second time and then hear nothing but a number of very general, vague, amorphous suggestions that what we need is a new industrial strategy.

I will try to point out the things that we are attempting to do and then suggest things that the members of the House, in unity, might do to deal with the problems faced by young people in the job market. Large numbers of young people are unemployed and that is something that this party does not tolerate any more than the other party. Early today hon. members opposite chided Liberals for making suggestions, but this just shows that the opposition cannot be very serious about wanting a full and open debate.

Perhaps the most useful and important suggestions have come from members of this party, who have looked at the problem seriously rather than repeating articles from *The Globe and Mail* or from the Friedman textbook ad nauseam. Members of this party have discussed the matter in great depth and have consulted with experts across the country. They do not follow orthodoxies. They do not pick up a textbook from a chamber of commerce meeting and repeat it in the House. They are trying to come to grips with the problem in an honest and intelligent way. Surely they should not be chided and the government should not be chided for listening to them. They are Members of Parliament doing their job, trying to come to grips with a serious problem and present answers to the minister. That seems to be the obvious, rational and proper thing for a Member of Parliament to do.

I would have to say again that it is curious and passing strange that the opposition finds, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said in question period, that the only things they can offer are things that members of this party have developed. I compliment members of this party for being so generous and charitable in sharing their ideas with members of the opposition so that they may have something to say in question period. We would be a lot better off if hon. members opposite would forget for a moment their entrapment in their own orthodoxies, in their own theologies and come to grips with the same kind of honest appraisal of the situation, using real facts and dealing with real problems, rather than trying to deal with a world that they have conjured up within their own little crystal balls.

Mr. Thacker: Socialism is the problem.

Mr. Axworthy: Now we have the hon. member for Lethbridge-Foothills saying that socialism is the problem. In his speech he was using the standard of 1968 when everything was good. He kept asking the rhetorical question, why? The reason is that we had Liberal governments before 1968 which had brought in all the measures he thought were so good. I would amend his comments to say that from 1968 until this year this country has had the strongest record of job creation of any country in the industrial world. We created more jobs for more people than any other country. We were creating jobs at the rate of about 4 per cent per year, or 350,000 jobs per year. During that period the government that is now being chastised was creating more jobs than any other country in the world.

This simply points out what we have had to repeat time and time again. It is not the commitment of this government to job creation that has changed. We are dealing with very different