

*Finance*

cant levels for more than three years—we should be using the public sector with creativity and imagination.

I want to list some of the facts.

**Mr. Woolliams:** What have we been listening to up until now?

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with attention if not exactly commitment when the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Clark) spoke, and I would appreciate the opportunity of presenting our views now.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** What are some of the realities that should be conveyed to the people of Canada? Let me speak first of all of investment prospects. Both the government and the Conservative party spoke of the need to have investment in the private sector. Let me point out the past performance of the private sector. The people who produced the lay-offs—Inco, Alcan, Christie Bread—are firms in the private sector. Anyone who pretends the lay-offs in those firms had something to do with government hampering them in some way, is speaking nonsense. The situation is quite the opposite. Governments in Canada have been aiding the corporations that have been laying people off. That is another argument, however.

The reality about investment is demonstrated in a planning document produced by the Minister of Finance in advance of the first ministers' conference. It pointed out that in order to get unemployment down to 5.5 per cent by 1982, we would need to increase investment in the Canadian economy by 7.3 per cent each year for the next four years. Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that for the past three years investment has averaged about 1.5 per cent. The minister gave no reason in the planning document that would lead us to anticipate significant growth in the private sector. How in God's name then does he anticipate we are going to get unemployment down to 5.5 per cent by 1982 if the expected rate of investment continues at the past levels?

Indeed, the planning document forecast no change in the level of investment for 1978 compared to 1977. The minister's expectation about improving the economy by 1982, in terms of investment, is just hog-wash according to the government's own reports.

Similarly the planning document released before the conference said that we need at least 300,000 jobs in each of the next four years. The record from each of the last three years shows that we only achieved 175,000 jobs. Therefore the forecast of 300,000 jobs to achieve the target of 5.5 per cent unemployment is just whistling in the dark. There is no reason why we should anticipate a level of job creation in the next three or four years twice as high as that in the past three or four years.

Things are the same in the manufacturing sector, which is crucial for any industrial society. The document says we need 74,000 new jobs in manufacturing in each of the next four years. In each of the past four years, however, we averaged only 17,000 new jobs. Now the minister is saying we need an

[Mr. Broadbent.]

increase of 500 per cent in manufacturing in each of the next four years in order to achieve his target. Again, he is whistling in the dark. There is not a shred of evidence that we will get that number of new jobs in manufacturing. It is 500 per cent higher on average that we have had over the past three or four years.

Those are some of the facts that I appeal to members of the House to heed. If I have no hope of convincing them—and I certainly do not—I hope increasing numbers of Canadians will listen seriously to the economic debate and consider the options.

If the investment picture is as bad as the government forecast would indicate, if the prospects for new manufacturing jobs are as poor as past performance indicates, if we have no reason to believe that the private sector is going to do in the next three or four years what it has not done in the past three or four years, then I must ask why we are so reluctant to consider the logical alternatives. We must consider our immediate needs against the history of the century.

The point I am making is that when private enterprise for whatever reason, and there are complex reasons, fails to create jobs, then public enterprise must be brought to bear. Surely that makes sense.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Broadbent:** The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) says nonsense. I would remind him that the premier of his own province, Mr. Lougheed, bought control of PWA, one of the largest airlines in Canada. Perhaps when a Tory government buys something that is not public ownership—but we call that public ownership.

**Mr. Woolliams:** That was to keep Barrett out.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Nonsense! Mr. Speaker, you can see frivolity that prevails here. The people of Canada will not accept frivolity. That same government led by Mr. Lougheed invested hundreds of millions of dollars in Syncrude. It made sense to have public investment there.

● (2042)

Bill Davis is the premier of a province which was the first in this country to embark on hydro development on a significant basis. That is a public investment that pays off in jobs now by creating energy in the future.

The point I want to make is that of all the times when we are talking about a need to deal with the Canadian economy and create jobs, and in the longer run bring down the level of inflation and therefore influence the international community which has responded in a way that has brought our dollar down, now is the time we must generate some growth in the Canadian economy. My God, I can tell the Prime Minister that one of his predecessors, Lester Pearson, and for that matter even Mackenzie King, recognized changing economics, and I cannot understand why the Liberals have lost their sense of historical perspective.