

The Address—Mr. Rodriguez

For example: "Unless expenditure restraint is embraced in a major way, recovery could be very sluggish. In fact, it could falter or even collapse". Another statement: "The strategy for British Columbia is clear. Only by focusing on restraint and productivity can the public and private sectors return to the basic reality that prosperity must be earned." Or: "It is essential to recognize that this is not restraint for the sake of restraint, it is restraint for recovery, for a return to earned prosperity." Or: "The Budget provides what is needed to contain the size and burden of government so the private sector will have the climate needed to ensure our fragile recovery gains momentum." That is what they were saying when they attacked the budget. Those were their phrases and sentences. It is very reminiscent of what we have heard here in the last three weeks or so.

Mr. Riis: Did it work?

Mr. Rodriguez: Well, has it worked? Here is the economic analysis of British Columbia, the 1985 outlook. It says that real output will decline by about .5 per cent this year. Retail sales fell for the third consecutive year in 1983, and they are expected to decline another .3 per cent in 1984. Although the volume of production in these industries has grown to exceed pre-recession levels, employment and profits have not. It goes on and on. We do not have to look south of the border or to Margaret Thatcher's Government. We do not have to go outside Canada; we can look right here at a home-grown Conservative-Socred Government in British Columbia. There is a hybrid right out there. As a matter of fact, this Government cannot wipe its hands clean of that Socred Government because it was members of the Ontario big blue machine that went out there to help Bill Bennett get elected in British Columbia. Pat Kinsella is one of the big blue machine cogs over here.

Mr. McDermid: You should be so lucky to have them.

Mr. Manly: Then they help these guys.

Mr. Rodriguez: Then they help the Tories across the way. Very good point.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have seen an example of how the deficit is being attacked. We have seen it in Canada, in British Columbia. We have seen the dismal results. Why do we keep repeating the mistakes? Why do we keep doing the same things over and over which will only exacerbate unemployment in this country?

Another area of credibility deals with social programs. During the campaign, the Prime Minister said that universality of social programs was a sacred trust. He said it would not be violated. Now all of a sudden everything is under review. He is going to review the social programs of this country. And who does he hire to help the Cabinet Ministers decide on recommendations for social programs? Why, that darling of the Chatham Chamber of Commerce, Darcy McKeough.

Mr. McDermid: Great Canadian.

Mr. Rodriguez: Darcy McKeough is absolutely opposed to the universality of social programs. So we have this kind of incestuous Tory relationship. We do now know who is doing what to whom in that group. I do not know what Darcy McKeough is being paid. I am sure it is very restrained wage. But here is the hatchet man from the Ontario Tories who is going to help this Government decide on the universality of social programs.

Another area covered by the Speech from the Throne and the budget statement was justice. Justice for the unemployed. To listen to these Tories across the way talk about unemployment you would think that the unemployed are just sort of numbers. They do not really care about the unemployed.

Mr. McDermid: No, no. That is the way you treat them.

Mr. Rodriguez: They do not really care, not when they bring in something so chintzy, cheap and chiselling as the financial statement which attacks programs designed to relieve unemployment in this country. As I sat in my office yesterday, I read a letter from a constituent. She writes that her letter concerns her husband. He is a hard-working man who will try any kind of work available, as we can see by the attached resumé. He is a proud man who wants to support his wife and six-month-old son. He has been trying to get a job since December, 1983 with no success. He worked for eight weeks in our community, but when the Government workers supervising the project noticed that he was 27 years old, they laid him off. He was too old for the project. He is too old for all the youth projects and too young for the middle-aged programs. What can he do? He will work at anything, anywhere, as long as the pay and benefits are reasonable. He will even go out of town or out of province for work. He has an opportunity for employment, but it will not come through until April of 1985. What should he do until then? He and his wife could manage if he could receive unemployment insurance, but he only has eight weeks of employment so he cannot even apply for that. They do not want welfare, he wants to work. His wife is working at the moment, but she will be laid off very shortly. They asked me to see what I could do to help them.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that Ministers get removed from the realities of unemployment. They do not get to see the realities of unemployment. I know they are good people at heart and if they saw this reality they would understand. However, they are mistaken. Their idea of putting people to work is by tightening the unemployment screws and whipping them so that they will manage to find jobs which do not exist.

• (1530)

If the Government is sincerely interested in creating employment I suggest that there are three sectors in Canada which have potential for creating much employment. First, there is the forestry industry. Second, there is the fishing industry. The third is the transportation industry. These are sectors in which the Government should be running up another deficit—I suggest a \$30 billion deficit—to put people back to work. If there was a war tomorrow the Government would find another \$30