

Supply

framework of five key objectives which I think are critically important to us to achieve the national consensus we all are talking about today. I have alluded to some alternatives that should be considered at the time of the next budget. I believe that these are the key to economic recovery and the rebuilding of confidence in our country so we can have a strong and self-reliant future. That is the way we have to develop our country in the eighties.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson) a question. It relates to his comments with respect to the effect that increased deficits would have on long-term interest rates. All of us concede there would be a crowding out and that might be part of it. I draw that to his attention in light of what was said by the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) who, in response to a question, indicated that he would be in favour of higher deficits at this time in order to help get our economy going and create meaningful jobs for those who are unemployed. Is the Hon. Member against higher deficits or is he in favour of higher deficits?

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member's question illustrates the real problem of understanding we have in this country of what is meant by higher deficits and what is meant by Government stimulus. It can come in many different ways. If he had listened carefully, he would have heard the Hon. Member for Rosedale say that the direction we in this Party would be following would be increased incentives for training, investment and investment in new technology.

The direction which this Government has followed, and has followed to an increasing degree in the past three years, is to do this through a grant where big money is paid out to selected elements of the economy, selected companies, rather than through a tax incentive where all companies can take advantage of it if they are going to participate directly in some sort of investment which will create economic activity immediately.

The difference is that we believe the incentive approach would have a much more immediate economic impact. Another aspect of it is that it is an investment in the future through training, product development and increased research activity. We believe the result will have considerably less impact on the deficit than the high profile megaproject infrastructure spending that the Minister of Finance is talking about. We believe our approach will have less impact on the deficit than those things which the Minister of Finance has been talking about.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the answer to the question is yes, the Conservative Party is not against higher deficits as they relate to the attempts by the Government to deal with job-training programs.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, we think that the impact on the deficit in a very short period of time will be that the deficit will drop because there will be investment in new jobs, in new plants and equipment which will create new jobs, and take people off unemployment insurance and welfare. I again

underline that it is an investment to create new technology and training programs to help individual Canadians face the future in a more productive way. The results will be a lower deficit.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair was prepared to recognize the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis). Perhaps there has been a change.

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (York South-Weston): Mr. Speaker, I would have welcomed this debate infinitely more if the wording of the motion had been changed to reflect what I believe is an absolute necessity in this country, the necessity that we all get together as rational human beings without this unnecessary confrontation, and try to find among ourselves ways and means to end the unemployment situation which is reaching absolutely endemic proportions in all OECD countries. Instead, we are treated to such wording as blaming the Government for so-called "callous disregard and tragic neglect of the dire economic and social plight of over two million Canadians who are unemployed". That is palpably untrue and grossly unfair.

I will zero in on one sector only during my remarks, that is the unemployed youth, and quote some interesting statistics. The Minister already quoted a whole litany of programs put in place by this Government to help the unemployed.

As regards youth unemployment, Employment and Immigration Canada is spending about \$2.5 million per day on youth aged 15 to 24 years through 20 different programs and services which provide either employment or employment development. Can that be called callous disregard? Obviously not.

Since the fall, special measures have been put in place for youth, specialized youth units in every Province of Canada, new youth out-reach projects and \$10 million Canada community development projects.

I may stop at this point to remark on something which was said a little while ago by the Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon). He mentioned in particular the community development project as it is short-term and therefore, he implied, totally unworthy. Let me give one example of the kind of results that can be achieved through the various training programs put in place by this Government. I shall refer to one particular project that was funded by the community development program which happened to be in my riding.

The cost of the program over one year was exactly \$100,000. We managed to get it repeated because of the success of the results. In one year and a half, that is since the inception of that project, the homes of 87 senior citizens and low-income people were renovated at a cost to the low-income owners of the materials only. A further 27 projects are already under way, and of prime importance to the young people of Canada, in that project alone, 21 young people have received training for which they have all now passed their apprenticeship aptitude tests. Two of those young people have themselves opened their own businesses and are in turn employing other