

Income Tax Act

partisanship and want to make Canadians and their economy appear as though they are mediocre and reflect a disastrous situation.

An hon. Member: They have a negative approach.

Mr. Roy: It is a negative approach and what was rejected last February 18 was indeed that negative approach which makes them criticize everything without objectivity. Everyone talks about inflation and, of course, we have inflation in Canada but, between 1960 and 1979, unemployment went up 520 per cent in Australia, 443 per cent in West Germany, 108 per cent in the United Kingdom, 90 per cent in Japan and 40 per cent in Sweden. At 27 per cent Canada ranks second behind the United States in job creation. I have here some figures which reflect the situation as regards job creation. In Australia, for example, a country with a rather rightist government, the number of jobs has increased by 12 per cent. In Sweden, under the socialist administration, the increase was 9 per cent. I should have liked, had we had more time, to speak a little longer about the Swedish socialist party, since the PQ government wanted to somewhat imitate or copy Sweden's socialist administration. I hope Quebeckers, come the next election, will remember the economic performance under the socialist or social-democrat system in Sweden where today more employees or workers are employed in the public than in the private sector. That is not what we intend to do, Mr. Chairman, absolutely not. But that is what some try to have us say or to make people believe. Members of the Progressive Conservative Party suggest that the Liberal Party has become a socialist party. On the contrary, we are a centre party and we want to enlarge the centre. We want to reduce the budgetary deficit, but we are aware of our responsibilities to the disadvantaged people as well as to small and medium-sized businesses in need of economic incentives. I intend to revert to that later. As for job creation, Canada was first among OECD countries. Our economy had the best growth rate for the years 1970 to 1979 with 55 per cent, as compared to France with 41 per cent, Japan with 38 per cent, the United States with 29 per cent and Sweden with 19 per cent.

● (1540)

What is important and what I realized on this trip is that food is less expensive in Canada than anywhere else in the world. That is consistent with the statements made by the Minister of Agriculture who often refers to the cost of a food basket in U.S. dollars—but unfortunately people do not quite realize it. Let us compare the cost of a food basket in Canada and elsewhere. In Canada, it costs \$55.58, in the United States, \$58.02, in Australia, under a fairly rightist government, \$66.70, in Sweden, under a socialist government, \$99.68, in Japan, because we are often asked to compare Japan's economy or economic performance to Canada's, the same food basket which in Canada costs \$55.58 U.S., costs \$135.10.

Let us now consider the number of hours of work needed to purchase those groceries. In Canada, seven hours of work are required and about the same in the United States. In Australia, a few more hours are needed; in Sweden, it takes 14 hours of work to purchase those groceries; and in Japan, 25 hours of work. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on. That is an indicator of the Canadian economy, an indicator which members opposite never mention. They say, "The economy is in a slump. The government is going socialist." Well, let us talk about that. Reference is also made to the flight of capital, to an unfavourable climate for investment.

I have here a speech made by Senator Bud Olson, Minister of State for Economic Development, at the "Business Outlook for 1980" conference held in Toronto by the Conference Board of Canada. The minister mentioned that capital is an important source of growth for our economy, and I quote:

We can always borrow abroad, of course, and that is what we have done in the past. In fact, the foreign percentage—as opposed to the national percentage—of investment capital in Canada has gone from approximately 5.5 per cent at the beginning of the decade to 9 per cent at the end. This is an increase of some \$3.75 billion in foreign borrowings in that period.

So then, those foreign countries chose to invest in Canada and their investments doubled in the last ten years. They chose Canada because it was in their interest to do so. It is our responsibility to develop a climate favourable to investments. I think that these new tax measures contained in the budget brought down by the Minister of Finance are yet another government initiative designed to encourage job creation, stimulate small and medium-sized businesses and develop our industry.

I should also like to reply to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain who spoke last night. I have considerable respect for the hon. member who, at one time, was minister of agriculture. However, when he mentioned yesterday that we should encourage Canadians to participate increasingly in energy programs, in fact he was preaching Canadian ownership of Canadian industries. He mentioned how important it is for Canadians to invest in Canadian institutions and industries. That is precisely what we are doing. We are striving to Canadianize increasingly the oil industry. That is the Liberal program, the Liberal policy which was rejected by big business on February 18: they would rather continue squeezing money out of the Canadian provinces, the Canadian people, and continue to fatten up the oil industry. What have we done? One need but read what the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources announced: an amount of \$100 million to help co-operatives and credit unions take a more active part in energy development.

The discussions launched last May with the various co-operative unions, whose membership exceeds nine million Canadians, should result in total investments estimated at over \$1 billion. That is what we are doing now, Mr. Chairman. It seems to us that on the other side, because of partisanship or lack of objectivity, hon. members keep on preaching, without