

*Supplementary Borrowing Authority*

the survival of the fittest, abandoning all pretence of the search for justice and international peace.

Whatever happened to the North-South dialogue? Whatever happened to those noble statements of the Prime Minister? They are gone like the wind. Instead we see him wallowing in the philosophical slime of social and economic Darwinism. Canadians have a destiny to do better than that. Canadians have a destiny to do better than adopt the politics of despair which the Prime Minister practises, despite all the rhetoric about trust. Canadians have a choice, and that choice is to accept the invitation of the New Democratic Party to imagine with us and to work with us for the better world which I believe is still within our grasp, if we reach out for it together. This kind of idealism, Mr. Speaker, is the only realistic option left to us—it is not idealism anymore—it is the only option. The realists and the cynics in the Liberal and Conservative Parties like to scoff at the naivete and idealism of the NDP. They have given up on the human condition and they have given up on Canada. They have given up the vision of a country which could have been an example to other nations. And in the name of being competitive, they would have us slide down the hill which so many Canadians have struggled to climb over the years toward a decent and just society.

● (1540)

We in the NDP intend to make sure that those who went before us did not struggle in vain, Mr. Speaker, and the Government will dismantle their accomplishments over the last 30 years over our dead bodies. Canadians now must go beyond the welfare state and Keynesian economics to the politics and economics of democratic socialism. They must not fall prey to the seductive vision of returning to the days of raw capitalism and the law of the jungle, which is the alternative offered to them by the Conservatives and now, quite clearly, by the Liberal Party of Canada. The choice belongs to the people, Mr. Speaker, and we welcome the debate that must ensue over the quality of our future.

I would like to make a few remarks now about the deficit because you hear a lot of ranting and raving about it. I would just like to make a simple suggestion: when politicians talk about the deficit, they should make the same intelligent distinction that average working Canadians make when they talk about their debts. That is to say that they know there is a difference between what they owe on their monthly grocery bill and what is the outstanding debt on their house amortized over 25 years. If they owe \$45,000 on their house, for instance, they do not say at the end of January, my God, our debt for January is \$45,000, because they make a distinction between current operating debts and long-term capital debts. Yet, all the discussions about deficits in this country take place without that distinction being made, so that the people are never able to get a handle on what is long-term investment, what may come back to the Canadian people in terms of having laid the groundwork for a more productive future, and what might rightfully be regarded as waste and over-spending.

It seems to me that we do the Canadian people a disservice when we talk about the deficit, whatever our position is on it, without making these kinds of distinctions. We create needless confusion about a topic that needs much more intelligent attention than it often receives in this Chamber, or, for that matter, elsewhere across the country.

I just want to put that concern on the record because it relates to what I was saying earlier about investment and how we need to have the right kinds of investment made in this country by Government and by the private sector in co-operation with Government and with the direction of Government, so we can invest in the kinds of things that will lead to a better Canada. We need to invest in our transportation system, housing, alternative energy, and all the things that need to be invested in in this country, and not have it regarded as needless Government spending.

We need to make a distinction between those two kinds of expenditures, which we do not do now, so we can have the political and conceptual freedom for Governments to spend where they ought to spend in building the needed economic infrastructure.

I mentioned transportation, Mr. Speaker, and in this respect I would like to speak just briefly about the policy of this Government toward railways. I was amused to listen to the Prime Minister during his television address. He said we have to prepare for the recovery. We have to have faith in Canada. We have to show that we trust that we will come out of this. While the recession is on we can do preparatory work, he said. Perhaps it can be explained to me, Mr. Speaker, how in the name of God you can call laying off 1,100 people at the CPR shops in Winnipeg, preparatory, when there is rolling stock galore to be repaired which, if there is going to be a recovery, will be needed?

It seems the CPR does not believe there is going to be a recovery, but if the Prime Minister does, he should call his friends at the CPR and tell them to put those men back to work instead of paying them 80 per cent of their wages to do nothing. If that is the kind of economic policy we get from this Government, then we might as well pack it in. We hear a lot of talk about the piddling job-creation programs which were brought in in the economic statement by the Minister of Finance when for another 20 per cent of their wages he could have all the CPR shops back to work preparing for the recovery which the Prime Minister says is coming.

If the Minister of Finance wants to have any credibility at all, that is the first thing he should do, get those men back to work and guarantee there will be no more lay-offs on either the CPR or CNR, because there is absolutely no excuse for lay-offs, in the railway sector. There is rolling stock all over this country which will be needed when the recovery comes. It is unrepaired now. Three years from now the railways will be whining and snivelling that they do not have the equipment, if, hopefully, there is a recovery. And they will want some money. How much more money do they have to get? They are saving millions of dollars because of the six and five program. Workers had their wages limited to six and five. That was not good