

Borrowing Authority

to meet here in the next few weeks. Certainly it is the most important thing he has to do.

● (2100)

So, as a result of this indifference to Parliament, to the body in which this party professes to believe so strongly, I should like to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Timmins-Chapleau (Mr. Chenier), which reads as follows:

That this bill be not now read a second time but be stood until the Minister of Finance agrees to appear before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs at the pleasure of that committee and preceding the appearance of the governor of the Bank of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)): Order, please. I have some reservations as to the wording of this motion and I reserve the right to let Mr. Speaker make a ruling on it tomorrow.

Mr. Mark Rose (Mission-Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering for a moment, when I saw the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) stand up, whether or not I would have an opportunity to speak this evening.

An hon. Member: Why don't you stand up?

Mr. Rose: The hon. member for Okanagan North (Mr. Whittaker) asked me why I do not stand up. I would like to advise him that he could see me if he would return to me that orchard ladder he once borrowed when I lived in the Okanagan.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rose: I would like to say that this is the first opportunity I have had to speak since I was resurrected and allowed to return to this House.

An hon. Member: He even looks like Lazarus.

Mr. Rose: I suppose it is impossible to give a second maiden speech. However, if one can be maiden more than once, it would probably be a miracle, and if it were a miracle, then I would be all for it.

As I have been away for a number of years, it was interesting to see the changes in Parliament. I would say that the changes I see are most revealing. The people who are offering the solutions to our country's problems are sitting in the opposition and are called Liberals, and the people who are sandbagging what the Liberals are trying to suggest as solutions to our problems in this country are now sitting in the government. It is almost the same old gang—new faces but the same old policies. I am not, of course, the first one to have noticed that.

We hear the government claiming that they have a mandate for restraint, and I will congratulate the new government for winning a minority Parliament. But if winning a minority government is a mandate, then I do not know what it means not to have a mandate, because if you look at the particular voting pattern in this country, you will find that more people in this country did not want that government than voted for it. So

[Mr. McRae.]

what kind of a mandate is that? It is artificial, it is an assumed mandate, and it does not have the backing of even 40 per cent of the Canadian population.

Mr. Knowles: It has only 36 per cent.

Mr. Rose: As a matter of fact, the hon. member, who has been here since 1860, says that the mandate amounts to about 36 per cent.

Mr. Knowles: Parliament did not start until 1867.

Mr. Rose: I am sure you were here then, Stanley.

Anyway, I think a number of other people over this past couple of weeks during the throne speech debate have noticed the irony, almost the cynicism, of what has happened since the Conservatives have gone over there. The party across the way voted against cuts to UIC during the last Parliament. On July 1 they allowed them to come into operation. People notice those things, you know. People notice that there is a facade of new morality which is nothing more than a repetition of the old morality.

An hon. Member: They call it consistency.

Mr. Rose: Yes, I suppose you could. We have the nattily attired member who is the Minister of Finance. He is suggesting that maybe UIC has been too generous, that UIC competes with employment, that certain kinds of benefits discourage the incentive to work, and that unemployment is not as devastating as it used to be because a number of members of families have jobs when perhaps only the male breadwinner was unemployed. It is interesting to hear that coming from a member from the maritimes, or a member from the Atlantic provinces. I would imagine that the minister would prefer being called a member from the Atlantic provinces than a member from the maritimes.

We have heard a similar statement from the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Stevens). Since those two men are responsible for the direction of this country and we expect from them a lot of hard discipline and diligent work, I would like to ask everyone whether the fact that they have a good deal of backing in terms of finances or, to put it in plain terms, the fact that they are rich men, lessens their incentive to work? I think they would be the first to deny it, but certainly for the Minister of Finance, as the representative of a part of the country which has the highest unemployment in Canada, to go on television and suggest that UIC benefits should be cut down, or that perhaps we should look at them with a view to cutting them down because they destroy the incentive to work, is hypocrisy. It is unbecoming to the very humorous Minister of Finance.

An hon. Member: Humorous?

Mr. Rose: His friends are laughing all the way to the bank.

Another matter is the raise in interest rates. Many hon. members have spoken about that and I do not intend to beat it to death, but I will tell you what it is doing to my riding. If you