

*Government Orders*

this government commits itself to full employment as a central core, as a central goal of government. That means a commitment to putting the creation of jobs first and foremost of the aims of government. It is more important than controlling inflation or controlling the deficit.

It means that employment is not sacrificed in order to deal with problems with the deficit, problems with interest rates, problems with inflation. It means that unemployment is not created in order to deal with these other economic problems. They are admittedly important economic problems but they should not be dealt with on the backs of the unemployed and on the backs of the poor.

Unemployment should not be created in order to reduce inflation. It should not be created in order to control interest rates. It should not be created in order to deal with other economic problems. A commitment to full employment means that other economic indicators will be dealt with in other ways, but we will ensure that all Canadians have the opportunity to adequately paid, decent jobs.

The government has not been very successful in its job creation efforts, again as committee after committee of this House has heard. We have seen increases in part-time, temporary and low wage jobs in the service sector, but we have not seen any net gain in decent paying jobs in the manufacturing sector. In fact, we have seen net losses.

If the present federal government wants Canada to be competitive, which it says it does, then why has it cut funding to education more than any other government in the history of Canada? Why has it burdened provincial governments in such a way that it is unable to function effectively to respond to the needs of the competitive world market?

If we are serious about solving our social problems, if we are serious about solving our economic problems, we cannot continue to pursue the policies that this government has pursued. We have to put full employment at the top of our agenda with all the ramifications involved including education, technical training and the need to ensure that there is a child care policy which enables people to take advantage of job opportunities. We need adequate housing, again a commitment which this gov-

ernment has broken with regard to co-operatives and social housing. We need to ensure that we have a fair tax system so we have the resources needed in order to cover the costs of the programs that Canadians view as so important.

We do need a commitment to full employment. That commitment to full employment, where it is being pursued across this world by social democratic governments, has been successful in reducing the costs, the burdens of social assistance. In countries like Norway, for example, the child poverty rate is 5 per cent; in Canada it is 25 per cent. It is not an accident. There is a strategy which is available to this government if it wants to pursue it. No Liberal or Conservative government since the war has even begun to think in these terms.

It appears that we have to concentrate in dealing with this government on emphasizing the economic costs of dealing with the situations we have. It is not enough for children to be poor in this country to get this government to respond. It is not enough for people to be unemployed in this country to get this government to respond. It is not enough that students cannot attend university to get this government to respond.

It is important to recognize the economic pay-offs as well as the social and humanitarian benefits of dealing with these social problems. Fewer poor people will translate into increased tax revenues as they work and contribute to the government's efforts as well as government savings resulting from reduced demand for social security, health care, subsidized child care, subsidized housing and so on. A better educated and trained work force would not only be an important solution and response to poverty, but essential to Canada's economic survival and prosperity.

A more effective and lasting solution rather than to slash spending on social programs would be to cut the demand for social programs, to be preventive in our approach, to try to respond to the economic, social and health damage caused by unemployment and low wages, by pursuing economic policies directed toward full employment and decent paying jobs.

As we know, Canada spends billions of dollars on unemployment insurance for the jobless, on social assistance for the long-term unemployed and single parents who cannot find child care and a job, on income supplements for the elderly who work for low wages and