interest rates?" by R. B. Bryce in the February 1982 *Choice* Magazine. Mr. Bryce points out:

> Canada has a highly developed capital market, open to capital markets elsewhere in the world without any, serious restraints . . . it is particularly closely related to the huge and open capital market in the United States.

If we were to set up exchange controls as some so quickly and easily suggest, the leaks and sieves would become obvious immediately. It is simply too easy for Canadian investors and lenders to go into the United States and take advantage of rates there. We have seen it time and again over the past two years. Whenever our own rates fall slightly lower than the American rate, pressure begins to develop on the Canadian dollar. We must never make the mistake of assuming, as Mr Bryce points out, that exchange controls can be offered in an easy or flippant fashion. The country is simply too integrated with the general North American capital market.

The other answer that many people put forward to answer this close interdependence in the American market is to let our dollar drop, in effect to devaluate our dollar. As I pointed out, people in my riding have asked, why not let the dollar go down to 75 cents, why hold it at 80 cents? There is no magic in the 82-cent figure or 80 or 85. There is equally no magic in the 75 cent number. People who put that idea forward with such great ease forget there is no guarantee that the Canadian dollar would stop once it hit the desired target of 75 cents. If we then found that out, how would we get it to stop as it continued to drop?

People also forget when they put forward this option that when the Canadian dollar is at 82 cents, it has already gone through this kind of devaluation. We experienced that over the past few years. The supposed benefits we were to experience with our exports are already in place. What we now have to do is to take advantage of those benefits and at the same time stop looking for excuses and stop trying to get another round of devaluation. Instead, we must look at our own economy and solve some of the problems in it.

Some of those solutions are here and in place. I refer my friend from Kamloops-Shuswap to the statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to the first ministers' conference on February 4. On page 5 of the document which I obtained from his office, he says:

> Experience both here and elsewhere has shown us that you cannot have real, long-term economic development, or generate lasting employment, unless you are first prepared to deal with the problems like inflation which stand in their way.

I want to emphasize the next point made by the Prime Minister:

> There is no avoiding the requirements of self-discipline.

That is the point in our economy today, not the search for quick answers such as a lower dollar or exchange controls or some other externally applied solution. Today we heard some of the answers put forward by the NDP. They were well thought out. The difference I have with them is in timing. We are not going to change our economy in the basic structural way that they indicate quickly enough to be able to answer the immediate problems of home owners or businessmen in my riding or in theirs. Indeed, it becomes somewhat of a self delusion to look only at those answers. By looking at them, we begin to see magic solutions instead of the kind of self-discipline that the Prime Minister has described.

If we are going to attack inflation, we will follow the kind of answers given to us by my predecessor, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre in his earlier speech. I welcome the kind of advice we have heard from the NDP on this matter, that we must continue to look for ways to cushion the most vulnerable people without destroying that sense of self-discipline and that sense of creating economic priorities. We need to create those priorities. We also need to find ways to protect the most vulnerable people.

We again saw a difference between their party and ours today when the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) asked the Minister of Housing (Mr. Cosgrove) what he would do about current mortgage rates. The leader of the NDP wanted a policy that would apply to everyone. The Minister of Housing repeatedly stressed to him the importance of targeting, setting priorities and helping the most vulnerable.

The Minister of Housing is right. We should provide a sensitive program to help people genuinely in need and not give in to the temptation to provide a universal mortgage program. We heard from the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. Nevertheless, he may continue if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fisher: I just want to make a couple of quick points. We heard from the hon. member for Laurier today about some of the activities being carried out to help small businesses and to assist in job creation. Those are important points. They too target through programs like ILAP, or some of the efforts undertaken in the forestry industry and so on. Those are targeted, not universal projects. Today the country cannot afford vast, universal projects.

We are looking for the middle of the road. We are looking for long-term strength, self-discipline and creating confidence to show we are genuinely serious in our fights against inflation.

As the hon. member for Ottawa Centre said, we need both monetary and fiscal restraint. We need solid answers and self-discipline rather than the sort of magic we heard about earlier. Moving though those magic ideas are, they are no longer appropriate in a tough world where we cannot have everything, where we must make a list and set priorities.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, in the very few minutes remaining to me, I want to congratulate the new Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fisher) on his excellent maiden speech in that capacity. He has a very difficult job. I certainly would not want the job of supporting the present Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen). In all likelihood he is going to end up burned out, washed up,