

The Budget—Mr. Hawkes

That was the path that we were on, led by Tweedledee and Tweedledum, the doom and gloom twins of the Liberal and NDP partnership. That is what that was all about. We see it every day during Question Period. We hear it every day in their speeches.

Those members of my Party who are a little concerned about the polls need but one simple strategy. It is this. We should arrange a 40-minute speech by the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada every day in the House of Commons so that Canadians can really get to see them. In this way Canadians will really get to know them and understand what is on their minds. Our Budget will soon look better and better. We may even have to invent a new law to provide some type of Opposition after the next election because we may have every seat in the country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great attention to what I was going to call the speech of the Hon. Member, but perhaps I should not call it that. Needless to say some of his statements were not totally, 100 per cent, accurate. I could describe them otherwise, but Your Honour would probably not allow me to do so.

I wish to ask the Hon. Member a question, he who has just spoken of so many things, particularly of the need to increase revenues for the Government. He said that in his view this would give the Government more to give out in terms of programs and so on. Does he feel that the ability of the Government to deliver on these programs is increased by giving out a \$500,000 lifetime capital gains tax exemption to be used on such things as selling off one's horse in Kentucky or one's condominium in the Cayman Islands or other such investments? Perhaps I should wait until the young Minister, or is it the Minister of State for Youth (Mr. Charest), finishes briefing him on his answer and then ask him the rest of my question. As much as I hate to interrupt the Hon. Member's *tête-à-tête*, which he is having with the Youth Minister, could he reply to my question?

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I wish my university professors had treated me so easily with their questions. It would have made school a lot more fun and a lot less anguish.

I think there is a basic human characteristic, that most of us like rewards. We like praise. We like achievement. We are born that way. It can be seen in an infant as it can be seen in an adult. It is the willingness to make an investment, to put one's money on the line, to risk winning and losing, to risk gaining that reward or to risk not gaining it that lies at the heart of job creation. In November of 1984 we said yes to the capital gains tax exemption. We believe that it will create more jobs. We believe that reward mechanisms are powerful. It did create jobs. The Liberals and the New Democrats said that it would not create jobs. They took it away and the jobs

went with it. We put it back in place and the jobs came back. We will keep it in place since it creates jobs.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to listen to the normally careful and measured tones of the chairperson of a committee that has done quite interesting and useful work with respect to refugees suddenly come out with this bizarre diatribe which bears no relationship to the facts at all. Of course there are some good things in the Budget. There is the elimination of the stupid mistakes of the past, such as the tariff on books and Christmas trees which even Conservatives had to fight against.

I wish to ask the Hon. Member three questions. If this country is in such great shape, and if Alberta is in such great shape, then why is it that according to the latest statistics from Statistics Canada there are unemployment rates in different regions of Alberta well over 12 per cent? At the moment the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in Alberta is 12.8 per cent. We are not talking about this being the result of the impact of Alberta's winter or anything like that. It is 12.8 per cent in different parts of Alberta. Why is that the case if Alberta is in such great shape?

● (1420)

Second, why should it be that the country's growth rates in every single year since the Conservatives took power have declined? Why should that be the case if the country is in such great shape? In 1984 the rates were 5.5 per cent. Each year since the Government has been in power they have gone down and they are projected for next year to be only 2.8 per cent. Why should that be the case?

Finally, I ask if the country is in such superb shape, and if the Government knows how to get along with the business community, and if it knows how to put our house in shape, why is it that the investment rates in the country—not for houses, not for co-operatives—but the investment rates for private business have been decreasing? They are not lower than they have been, but they are actually physically decreasing. According to the *Budget Papers* they decreased this fiscal year by 1.2 per cent. So much for the great success of Conservative economics. It is no wonder that the Member had a tough time in his university courses. In view of that, I wish he would be a little more careful and in the future stick to the subject of refugees and immigration.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I could not help thinking that Alberta receives 8 per cent of the job creation funds today. Under the previous Liberal-NDP alliance they received less than 1 per cent. That was in the middle of the recession. By the time that came about in September, 1984, when the Government was finally chucked out, the unemployment rate in Alberta was 12.1 per cent. Lately it has gone back. Last month it was at 10.8 per cent. It started at 12.1 and went back to 10.8. Is this an economic catastrophe for my province that our unemployment rate is 1.3 per cent lower?

Mr. Langdon: It hurts a lot of people.