

Nationale, a party the hon. member have been supporting for approximately 12 years. It must be noted that those constituencies had been represented by members of the Union Nationale party for 35 or 45 years.

I think that Quebecers and other Canadians are not quite as stupid as the member for Sainte-Marie would have had us believe this morning. They know that their security under present circumstances is in the hands of this liberal government which is made up of so many brilliant men and Cabinet members who have the courage to take the necessary steps to steer the Canadian economy so as to aim it once and for all towards prosperity and the minimum of comfort which St. Thomas Aquinas considered necessary for leading a virtuous life.

That is what the government is trying to do and if one recalls the measures I mentioned earlier and applies them honestly instead of discrediting the government in the eyes of the public for political purposes, it will be seen that we are on our way to renewed prosperity and that we will not have to wait too long.

And when opposition members suggest that, that—

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to take part in this debate, one which in my opinion amounts really to a rerun of the March budget debate. By tradition, budget debates are very general in nature so I intend, like several hon. members who preceded me, to cover a number of different topics. I hope that what this speech lacks in unity it can make up for in pertinence, or possibly even in impertinence.

On budget night, listening to the minister, I had the distinct impression that I had heard it all before. To paraphrase the song from "My Fair Lady", I had grown accustomed to his farce. Whether or not the Canadian people believe the government's policies are farcical, I am certain the minister and the cabinet do not. Yet it is the people who will ultimately decide. I believe most Canadians find it very difficult, in the face of both constantly escalating prices and simultaneous unemployment, to place a great deal of faith in the

Economic Policies and Unemployment

government's policies. But only time, the risk of hideous unemployment and social unrest will decide this question.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I propose to discuss housing, unemployment and various interrelated matters. I note that the March budget proposed to continue the capital cost allowance deferral in three provinces, including my own province of British Columbia, for another two years. One wonders whether this so-called cooling-off technique is really working as it was intended to work. The move was obviously designed to inhibit commercial growth of low-priority construction in high-growth areas, a laudable enough aim, I suppose. But is it really working in this way, or is this deferral arrangement simply adding to costs in those communities of more than 50,000 inhabitants to which it is applicable?

It appears to me that if in fact this kind of discouragement of construction really works in high-growth areas—which, incidentally, are also high-employment areas—it might operate in just the opposite way to that which was intended. The government's policy will not encourage any businessman in his right mind to shift more money to slower growth areas and it may not, in fact, discourage construction in areas in which entrepreneurs have good prospects of commercial success. It might just be adding 2 per cent or 3 per cent more to the cost of construction, thereby contributing to the very thing the move was intended to discourage, that is to say, inflation.

On the other hand, if the arrangement is working, if it is discouraging construction, it may be contributing to unemployment in the building trades, thereby adding to our sorry record of unemployment, the worst in recent years. The government still seems blindly determined to pursue its policy of trading off employment against inflation even in the face of a growing chorus of criticism from reputable economists in Canada and elsewhere.

I am no economist, and I do not pretend to be one. But one glimpse of the unemployment picture will confirm the presence of real suffering all over Canada at the present time. One wonders how much more the people will have to suffer before the government takes a second look at the policies it is pursuing.

One famous economist and former Kennedy aide, John Kenneth Galbraith, told the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs a few weeks ago that voluntary guidelines such as those to which importance