

think it is odd or ironic that I should be talking about constituents who sell real estate, let me say that the mortgage interest rates today are causing a slowdown in that industry as well as limiting the opportunity for young people to acquire homes because they cannot make the monthly payments. To say the deductibility will help them is stretching the imagination, because you must at least have the down payment and you must have the mortgage before you have the opportunity to get the benefits of deductibility or the tax credits.

These are the problems affecting the country, problems which many people look to the new government to solve. But if the government is not committed to governing, how can it solve any problem? The government is committed to standing back and letting some other agency, usually the private sector, look after the problems of the country.

Members of my party sitting here tonight and members of the Social Credit party sitting opposite us are here because of the failure of the old line parties to deal with problems in the past 30 years.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Breau: Are you just a reaction to us?

Mr. Rose: Your reaction to us is zilch.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Scott, Victoria-Haliburton): Order, please. The hon. member should do us the courtesy to carry on with his speech.

Mr. Rose: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your intervention and protection, but I am accustomed to catcalls. I know that at least over there is a party of principles. I do not like their principles, but at least they have some.

● (2110)

I do not like the Gallup poll party opposite. Where will they go next? When they thought restraint was in, they moved to the right. Approximately ten years before that when they thought the new ethics, politics or counter culture was in, they moved to the left. Where will they go now? They will fall between two stools. They will get slivers. That is what will happen.

The third point I should like to make—

Mr. Kempling: What happened to the first two points?

Mr. Rose: I will go over my first two points again. I know the government whip has a very short attention span. So, for his benefit I will repeat what I said. Tories are going to cut UIC. They were against it. Tories are going to raise interest rates. They were against that too. They are going to cut short-term programs like Canada Works designed for people who need to work this winter, in spite of the fact that we have record high unemployment in nearly every municipality. Especially central Canada, Quebec and the maritimes are suffering high unemployment, including most of the constituencies located in the maritimes.

Borrowing Authority

The government has presented us with a bill to authorize the borrowing of \$7 billion for public works and general purposes. Just read the bill. We have not been told what public works nor even to what general purpose the bill refers. That is left deliberately vague. I assume what they are intending to do during the life of this Parliament—or at least this session—is to reveal these public works one by one and dazzle us with their revelation. It is rather like Pandora's box.

My hon. friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), made a comment about the government's belief in deficit spending and that they will borrow up to \$7 billion. We do not know to what general purposes the money will be put, nor do we know why Canada needs to borrow this money at all right now. I was not able to hear the justification for this borrowing, but I assume it is for some worthy purpose. But before dealing with question two as to what use this money is to be put, let me deal with questions one and three.

The government's answer to question one is to go futher into deficit spending and to borrow seven thousand million dollars to make up and to overcome the deficit caused by that spendthrift, drunken sailor government which just preceded them. That is not a bad line. In other words, they blame the previous government for all their own financial woes. Premier Bennett in British Columbia and Premier Lyon in Manitoba have been using this very effectively, so I take it that it is quite a good line. I expect we will hear more and more of it, as we have already heard it from the Minister of Finance several times.

The general philosophy of the government goes something like this in very, very folksy terms, "Folks, we did not want to be big meanies, we didn't want to be tough guys. We are sorry for the shape you are in because of that awful previous government that you elected. But you folks want too much. You want to take too much out of the economy and you do not put enough back in, so consequently all of us have to tighten our belts so that our government can make certain hard decisions in order for our system to survive."

I think that is true. It is important for the government to make tough decisions in order that the system we have lived under survives. In order to have it survive we have to cut health care. We have to cut human resources. We have to cut day care. We have to cut out the lunch program in day care in British Columbia, and we have to cut out the outreach programs for women. And as less money filters down through the provinces to the universities we have to cut educational spending. Why do we do all these things? We do it so the system can survive. Sure, it is said to be for our own good. Now, what is this system we are trying to preserve? It is a system which accords special privileges to the well-heeled sector of Canadian society.

An hon. Member: Like Bill Kempling?

Mr. Rose: Well, I would not be as gross as to name a particular member on the opposite side.

Anyway, certain segments of society certainly will survive because they are accorded certain privileges. Our system sur-