

as any apprentices anywhere in the world, and better than many. There is no reluctance on the part of the trade union movement to be involved in apprenticeship programs. The difficulty has always been that employers found it easier to go offshore and hire skilled labourers and tradesmen rather than take the time to put in place apprenticeship programs to meet their needs for the future. There is very little evidence to show that the trade unions in any way inhibited the development of apprenticeship programs.

Leaving that aside for the moment and referring to the Massey-Ferguson bail-out, I put it to the Hon. Member that that is exactly the wrong way to go about establishing and maintaining a viable farm machinery industry. What was required was that farmers have more income in their hands in order that they could afford to purchase machinery. If the farmers could not buy the machinery it did not make any sense to keep the plant going. The changes to the Crow rate took money out of farmers' hands. That was our argument all along. You cannot change the Crow rate and demand farmers pay out more of their available income for freight costs and then expect that they will also have money available to purchase new machinery. That was why we argued against the changes to the Crow rate.

I submit to the Hon. Member that the funding of the development of the transportation system based on changes to the Crow rate, not totally but substantially, worked counter to the efforts of the majority of people to create employment. It worked counter to the efforts we were putting forward to try and stimulate the manufacturing sector. Although the Government had the germ of an idea, it went about it the wrong way.

● (1210)

I will make one final point which I think is the most important point. One of the main reasons that there was a fall-off in job creation in the country, albeit influenced by international events, was quite clearly the very high interest rates. The Member asked whether I am prepared to see the money spent to undertake these major works projects. The answer is yes, I am prepared to see the money spent. With regard to housing, if we built the 100,000 housing units and created the 280,000 jobs, every single penny that was invested would come back either in the form of mortgages or rents. In addition, 280,000 people who were previously unemployed would be working and paying taxes. The companies which make all the component parts, be it shingles or taps, would be manufacturing and paying taxes.

I suggest that investing in that industry or in the pipeline, which would be of the same benefit in the long run, or in many of the other projects that we suggested, is the way to get people back to work and paying taxes. It will increase confidence and reduce the debt load of the Government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): The Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain). The Hon. Member for Eglinton-Lawrence (Mr. de Corneille) on a point of order.

Supply

Mr. de Corneille: Mr. Speaker, I thought it had been indicated that we were going to hear from a member of each Party on the first round.

Mr. Deans: It is a question.

Mr. de Corneille: Is this still the question period?

Mr. Deans: It is a question.

Mr. St. Germain: It is a question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): We are still in the question period. I do not see what the Chair has done wrong in recognizing an Hon. Member who wishes to pose a question. The Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody.

Mr. St. Germain: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member made the statement that we cannot create jobs. Why do people need a job?

Mr. Deans: To get an income.

Mr. St. Germain: To get an income. This is exactly what he said.

Mr. Deans: That is right.

Mr. St. Germain: He suggests a shorter work week. I agree with him that we are going to have to share. In the fifties, sixties and seventies we did shorten the work week. How can the Hon. Member recommend this at this particular point in time when he knows that every small business, from which sector I came just nine months ago, is on the verge of bankruptcy? That sector is the creator of jobs.

The Hon. Member made an excellent speech but he gave no indication of how we are going to bolster the engine of growth which is small business. He claims that we must shorten the work week. I ask in all sincerity how we are going to stimulate growth so that these small businesses can afford it. I agree that some of the larger businesses can afford it, but how can small business afford it?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I will first say that there is no conflict in saying that you cannot create jobs and at the same time talking about looking at the work which needs to be done and doing it. In the process people become employed. I think the Member would recognize that there is no conflict between those two.

With regard to the work week, the argument being put forward by a significant number of people about the inadvisability of moving toward a shorter work week is the same argument that was put forward by basically the same people when the work week was shortened before. Although that argument has a certain appeal, it turns out in the long run not to have any real substance. If we are able to stimulate economic activity by doing a variety of things, as I suggest we will, if we are able to reduce the cost by stabilizing the interest rates and if we are able to stimulate activity in small businesses by virtue of the capital works projects, then the small business