Employment Tax Credit Act

The one distinct difference is that while this individual undergoes this training period he or she does not receive \$8.30 for the first hour which he works. The individual receives a small stipend of 50 cents or a dollar an hour. Of course my friends in the NDP would scream child labour and child abuse, but that party is representative of labour in this country.

Adam Smith, one of the earlier economists, talked about the invisible hand that regulates the free market system and free enterprise. A modern economist—and it was not my friend Larry Lewin—talked about another invisible hand. He referred to it as the invisible handshake. It is the handshake that is passed between big business, big labour and big government. It is that handshake which is responsible when members of that party get up in defence of large multinational corporations such as Chrysler.

An hon. Member: Time.

Mr. Oberle: That party would like the government to bail out Chrysler. Regardless of what Chrysler has done to their fellow workers in Britain, they want to bail out that company because there is an elite group of workers which may be affected. If Imperial Oil were in the same straits, they would do the same thing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. I tried to indicate to the hon. gentleman that he might be coming to the expiry of his time. Because I interrupted the hon. member earlier on a matter of language, I will give him a brief period to finish, something like one minute.

Mr. Oberle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not abuse the patience of the House. I have said what I wanted to say. I think that hon, members who are here tonight know what I know, what you know, and what every Canadian knows, that we can no longer put a band-aid here and a band-aid there. We must talk about fundamental reform of our economic and fiscal approach, our approach to our human resource, manpower training and our job-creation programs. We must talk about very fundamental reform of our political and institutional framework. Of course that process has begun and will accelerate after May 20, but I do not wish to get into that tonight.

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I respect your admonition of a few moments ago about the parliamentary use of the term "intellectual dishonesty" as being inappropriate in a parliamentary sense. It is also inappropriate in a substantial sense. As I sit here on the government side and hear both parties in opposition say the things which they say about us, I would rather use the term "naive simplicity". It is naive, because it really does not deal very much with the world which we are in, and it is simplistic in the sense that it takes only one side and sees one answer as the only answer.

I listened to the hon, member who spoke before me and other Tories before him, for the last seven or eight years saying that the government is involved in too many things, that the government is growing too big, that we were into things that we should not be into, all kinds of things which were more appropriate to the private sector. Or, if it was not appropriate for the private sector, they wanted to hand it all back to the provinces. This has been one side of the issue.

I have heard this same argument used with regard to the ratio of the net national debt to the GNP. This argument is constantly used by the parties opposite. I would ask the hon. member, when he uses that argument and with regard to his lumber business, if the line of credit that one would achieve would not be proportional to the size of the business operation. It seems to me that when one talks about debt, whether it is net national debt or another form of debt, one must put that line of credit against the size of the operation.

I do not see that anyone can relate the net national debt in an intelligent way unless one relates it to GNP. It is very interesting that under the government of the late John G. Diefenbaker, I believe it was 1962, that the net national debt as a function of the gross national product was something like 32 per cent, whereas now it is down to something like 20 per cent. I am not saying that in his time this was a bad situation. I am just not as sure that it is such a dangerous thing as the hon, member would seem to indicate.

On the other hand, the NDP has the simplistic notion that government can do anything and that there are no limits to what can be spent.

Mr. Rae: Careful, Paul, you are treading on your childhood.

Mr. McRae: I have a great deal of difficulty dealing with that philosophy. When one sits on this side of the House, one begins to think that we must be doing a few things right since we are being condemned by one group for doing too much and by the other group for doing too little. Somewhere along the line we have probably achieved a balance which most Canadians accept, and that is probably why we are here.

The employment tax credit bill can be criticized if it is looked upon as all that the government is doing in the area of employment. Of course, this is not the only measure that the government is taking. It is a limited type of bill which, for instance, is not designed for the kind of operation one might find in smaller communities, rural areas or large ridings. It is basically a bill which is perhaps more appropriate for larger cities, and that is why it is being introduced.

The bill is not being introduced to solve all the employment problems, and it is not the only piece of legislation which the government is putting into play. The bill supports certain groups of Canadians more than others, particularly young people who are trying to get on the labour market. The bill has a little more permanence, although it is not entirely permanent, than perhaps some programs such as the Canada Works program. To criticize this bill from the standpoint that the government is bereft of any other ideas, is nonsense. It is a limited bill introduced in the attempt to accomplish a certain things at a certain cost. It will achieve the kinds of results expected of it.