are going to create a new economic environment in Canada by making it clear to everybody that it is the private sector, not the state, that is the driving force of the economy". I say to the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Harris) that that is exactly our formula. It is to create an entrepreneurial spirit so that people will want to invest money in our country and, by so doing, create jobs.

How did we do that? We did it with the reform of the regulatory system and the tax system, by securing and enhancing access to world markets for Canadian goods and services in the United States and other parts of the world and by controlling the Government's deficit. These four major policies which we have implemented since September, 1984 have worked and have worked very well.

I want to say again to the Hon. Member for St. John's East that governments do not create jobs. Private enterprise creates jobs and it takes the credit. However, the Government does create an atmosphere and a stability so that people will want to invest in our country, and that is exactly what is happening. There have been 1,150,000 new jobs created since we took office in 1984. We lead all other countries in the world in our percentage of economic growth and reduction of unemployment. These are the facts. The formula is working. We are leading the rest of the world.

I would like to comment on what the alternatives might be if this formula were not used. What would the Opposition do? We know what the Liberal Party did when it was in power. It left our country literally bankrupt. There was record unemployment and record highs in interest rates. Why would anyone in his right mind think the Liberals, if they were ever to come back in power, would change? What would the socialist New Democratic Party do? It does not even look at private enterprise for economic growth. It likes to develop state-owned items.

The Opposition attacks us on regional development. I would like to to know what a Liberal-NDP coalition Government would do with the National Energy Program? Would they bring it back and ruin western Canada again? We know where they stand on free trade. They would rip the agreement up. Canadians recognize that three million jobs in Canada are directly or indirectly related to export of goods and services to the United States, yet the Opposition would ignore a free trade agreement which would secure and expand that access, creating new jobs.

What would the Opposition do about defence? We have the Air Command Centre in my riding of Winnipeg—St. James. It is an integral part of the economy of our area. What would happen if the New Democratic Party as a government pulled out of NORAD or NATO? The budget which is controlled by the Air Command Centre in my riding is $507 million. It has control of the operation of 22,000 military personnel, a total of some 30,000 when one counts the civilian personnel. Obviously, not all of these people are located in my riding, but one can readily see the impact that defence has in western Canada and in other regions of our country. The New Democratic Party has the idea that it is cheaper for us to be against NATO and on our own. In other words, we would control the northern warning system on our own. I believe the United States at the present time budgets something like $3 billion a year towards this system and the NDP would have us pick that bill up. What would the Opposition do if there was an attack on our country? Would they not allow the Americans to fly over our country in order to protect us? The NDP policy of withdrawing from NATO and NORAD is nonsense.

These are the types of things that the people of Canada will be looking at at the time of the next election. In my opinion as a member of the committee on finance for the last three and a half years, the policies of the Opposition would be disastrous for the citizens of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please! It being 5:45 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 84(7), to interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put the question on the amendment before the House.

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke-Centre), seconded by Mr. Lewis, moved:

That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

Mr. Garneau, seconded by Miss Nicholson (Trinity), moved the following amendment:

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"this House regrets that the Budget

1. failed to redress the inequities of the tax system created by Government policies put forward during the last three and one half years;

2. failed to put into place a regional development policy to compensate for the high interest rate policy of the Government;

3. failed to put forward a credible plan to deal with the national debt that does not unduly punish lower and middle income Canadians; and

4. failed to specify a Canadian approach for dealing with the instabilities of the international monetary system."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Garneau), which was negatived on the following division: