

you will see that we put more women to work on this side than they do on the other side.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: It was foreseeable that with immigration and with the higher birth rate there would be a very fast growth rate in employment. So what did we do? In the early 1970s we brought in the best unemployment scheme in the world, and we were not helped in this by the other side. We brought in a very generous—perhaps an overly generous unemployment system—in order to help those who we knew would be unemployed when these situations arose and when the baby boom emerged in the larger number of young people entering the labour force. So we brought in this very generous scheme, but since then we found some abuses of it, so we are tightening it up. Our first reaction, however, was one of intelligent compassion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We also went about creating more jobs. The growth of employment was created essentially by the private sector, but it was brought about in economic circumstances in which both the federal and provincial governments had a role to play. In our case we helped to create more jobs by way of budget deficits. Here I look askance at the leader of the NDP who always seems to be saying that we are cutting back too much. We must remind him that we will still have financial requirements for this year of some \$11.7 billion. So indeed we are cutting back the rate of growth. However, we are stimulating the economy to a very large extent indeed, to a much larger extent, comparatively speaking, than is the premier of Saskatchewan whom the leader of the NDP was citing as an example.

Mr. Broadbent: What is the growth level in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Trudeau: I am talking about the economic policy. The leader of the NDP suggests that we should be more stimulative than we have been. I am telling him that we are immensely more stimulative than the Saskatchewan government. That is the point I want to make.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: We have brought in a series of other measures. I cannot go into them all in detail, but let me just mention some in passing to show that this business of stealing each other's programs seems to have gone in a different direction than the one suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

Several years ago we brought in research and development incentives. We applied an investment tax credit to R and D, and then we gave additional R and D expenditures a 50 per cent write-off, so that the cost of a \$1 expenditure in R and D can cost as little as 20 cents. The Conservative party is only now getting around to encouraging R and D in its programs.

The Address—Mr. Trudeau

For years we have been bringing in measures to encourage small business. Their tax rates are half the tax rates of normal corporations. Recently we have allowed family corporations to roll over \$200,000 of capital gain without tax. Recently we have removed the manufacturing sales tax on the first \$50,000 of sales by small businesses. In manufacturing and processing we have reduced the federal tax level from 36 per cent to 30 per cent. We have given a two year write-off on machinery and equipment. We have given manufacturers access to the investment tax credit. And on it goes in the resource sectors and other sectors where we have been helping the private sector create jobs in ways which now the Tory party feebly proposes to imitate.

We have also—and I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition said nothing about that except to criticize it—embarked upon direct employment programs. I think he was criticizing the Opportunities for Youth program and other such programs, and yet many countries have come to Canada to see how successful our programs were, and have copied them. These programs have directly created jobs for many of our young people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1632)

Mr. Trudeau: This winter job experience training for youth will employ another 58,000 young Canadians. Next year \$710 million will be spent for job creation and training. That will involve some 370,000 people. I am not sure in what way one can look at the Tory response to this situation of high unemployment. They talk about putting the economy back to work. They talk about creating more money by making more work and by getting more taxes from having fuller employment. Apart from imitating some of our schemes, the trouble is that they do not say how to do it.

Obviously they have some economic policies. We can get glimpses of them when the hon. Leader of the Opposition announces a \$2,200 million tax cut. Then he has this mortgage and municipal tax scheme which will cost something in the area of \$1,600 million. Then he has a whole series of miscellaneous other programs for small businesses, research and development, and other things, which are feeble imitations of our programs. They are estimated at something like \$1.5 billion, for a total of \$5.3 billion.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition indicated that somehow he will fund this by eliminating the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Ouellet). Right away he will get \$20 million off the top. Out of \$5.3 billion he will get \$20 million. Then he will put an end to Petro-Canada. The saving there will be \$200 million. That is a total of \$220 million. Also we know he will abolish the Department of Multiculturalism. He told us that, approximately a year ago out west. That will result in a great saving of \$5 million.

Where is the other saving? It will be the 60,000 public servants who will be lost through attrition. The calculation which I read in the *Financial Times* indicated an approximate