

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: The difference will be in the atmosphere, in the way that we work together. And that atmosphere that has been poisoned by the determination to confront of this Prime Minister and his government can be changed by a recognition in Ottawa that the provinces are partners in confederation, not enemies. When we achieve that atmosphere of agreement I am convinced, as a Canadian from Alberta, who has worked to learn my second language and to understand the different cultures and the different conditions of this amazing country, that we can use that new atmosphere to address the larger questions of how our constitution reflects the cultural, the regional, and the national reality of Canada.

Let me turn now, sir, to the economy. It almost makes one choke to talk about it. I wish that the solutions to the nation's problems were as easy as simply taking a glass of water. What we need instead is a far more fundamental change. We are in this country now growing well beneath the potential of Canada.

Instead of real growth of 5 per cent, which with effective policies would be attainable, the Conference Board in Canada says that we will be fortunate to achieve 4 per cent this year and 3.7 per cent in 1979. We are paying an enormous price for that economic shortfall. Again, according to the Conference Board, a real growth of 4.75 per cent and an unemployment rate of 5.5 per cent would produce—and I emphasize these figures—\$41 billion more in new wealth over the next two years, wealth that could be used to generate new jobs, create new investment and create growth. The board also estimates that achieving those growth and employment targets this year and next year would increase the tax revenues of the federal and provincial governments by more than \$13 billion. That is one way to meet a deficit, because those are revenues which would help bring government financial accounts into much better balance.

It is not simply individual policies that are lacking now. There is absolutely no coherence to Canadian economic policy. There is no commitment to realistic economic targets. The minister and his own officials cannot agree. There is no over-all sense of direction. Yet the priorities for this economy are clear. First, Canada needs a program of major economic stimulus. I have proposed that kind of program based on the premise of putting money in the hands of individual Canadians who will spend their money more effectively than this government is spending it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: We have proposed a tax cut to put at least \$300 per year into the hands of lower and middle income Canadians.

● (1542)

We have proposed a program, phased in over four years, to allow partial deductibility of mortgage interest and property taxes.

The Address—Mr. Clark

We have proposed significant tax incentives for research and development and small business, and the use of tax contracts for companies locating in slow growth areas.

I say in all generosity to the government: if you have no program of your own, please take ours!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: Amend it if you will. You would probably want, on the question of mortgage deductibility, to consult your candidates in Westmount and York-Scarborough, both of whom agree with us. Once again, the Liberal party is split. I do not know whether it has anything to do with the Minister of Industry Trade and Commerce.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: I hear the question, "What about David Crombie?" As is not going to be the case with the Liberal candidates in Westmount and York-Scarborough, David Crombie will be in this House of Commons shortly to answer for himself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: When the minister puts that question—assuming he can get re-elected in his own constituency in time to come—he will find Mr. Crombie agrees completely with the program we have put forward and has said so on innumerable occasions. I wonder if the minister can say the same for his candidate in Westmount, and the same for his candidate in York-Scarborough.

I do not mind if the government, having borrowed our program, amends it, but at least it should bring some program to this parliament so that Canadians can believe this House of Commons is trying to deal with some of the economic problems the country faces.

Secondly, as well as stimulus, we need a restraint program that is real and has some purpose to it, has some permanence to it. There is absolutely no rationale to the government's so-called restraint program. For instance, in April, the government introduced incentives to research and development. But then what did they do? Now they dismantle fishery and forestry laboratories. They go out and fire civil servants, yet charge the people of Canada for the jet plane that takes the Prime Minister to talk to editors of the *Globe and Mail*.

Apart from the civil servants the Liberals have fired, there is no permanence to the government's so-called restraint program. It is, as the Minister of Finance said in Willowdale, the other night—we have got him on tape too—he said their program is merely a "pause"—and I quote him—before, as he put it, the government—and I am quoting again—"gets on again with redistributing wealth". That is their goal—not to generate wealth in this country but simply to slice, in decreasing and decreasing pieces, a slimmer pie.