

it becomes effective for all construction which started after the budget date, October 28, up to 1982; so it will have a two-year run. The objective is to reduce the shortage of rental units and introduces a scheme that will offer tax write-offs against other income for investments in rental units. Whether it will be any great boost by providing additional housing remains to be seen.

Mr. Blenkarn: It will really help the rich guys, though.

Mr. Darling: That is right; them that has gets, and them that do not have, loses what they already have.

● (1720)

The small business development bond program has been extended for three months until March 31, 1981. Money was also available for the CHIP program and I commend the government for this—but with reservations. The increase in the budget was from \$80 million to \$265 million to assist the program to reach its objective of upgrading 70 per cent of Canadian homes by the year 1987. Let me point out, however, that this grant is not free, because it is added to the taxpayer's income. The only places where it is an outright grant are in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia where it is tax-free. In my view the government should give serious consideration to extending this generosity to the rest of Canada. There are many old homes in other parts of Canada where the climate is colder that could benefit from such a grant, and I feel that the CHIP program is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde).

The other item that I should like to comment on is the Multiple Unit Residential Buildings program, MURBs. I spoke of this previously.

Another item is the mandatory mileage standards for new cars. I understand this will provide standards for mileage efficiency in cars. These have been voluntary until the present time. Measures will be enforced which are expected to reduce fuel consumption of passenger vehicles by 20 per cent between now and 1984. In contrast, the United States has had mandatory controls since 1975.

One of many major criticisms of the budget is that it has done nothing about the real economic problems that currently face the country. What is the purpose of a budget if it is not to address the economic problems currently plaguing the nation? This budget has ignored the unemployment problem in the country. Despite the figures issued by the Department of Employment and Immigration, I am sure, counting the people who are no longer in receipt of benefits and a great many who want to work but cannot find jobs, that we will face this winter with at least one million people unemployed. That is an absolute disgrace.

The budget has done nothing to bring down government expenditures, which was one of the things that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) promised before the February 18 election. We know now what a misstatement that was.

The budget has done nothing about the horrendous inflation problem. Again, we should remember the words of the Prime

The Budget—Mr. Darling

Minister—I am not sure whether it was in 1974, but several years ago he said, "We will wrestle inflation to the ground." He is not much of a wrestler because he has had little success with that! Yet the Canadian people accepted that and many other promises made in February, 1980.

An hon. Member: He also said that separatism was dead in Quebec.

Mr. Darling: That is another of his wise statements. A great many people say that the Prime Minister speaks *ex cathedra*—absolutely infallible. Some years ago he stated that separatism was dead in Quebec. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it died, it certainly had a resurrection.

An hon. Member: He also says it is now dead in the west.

Mr. Darling: It is far from dead in the west, thanks to the Prime Minister and the budget presented by the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance has admitted that federal spending will rise this year by 13.2 per cent to nearly \$60 billion. He stated that unemployment will continue to get worse before it gets better. That is a great and profound statement. Another thing he said is that inflation will continue in the 10 per cent range next year and that the massive \$14.2 billion deficit will be reduced only slightly in 1981. This is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker. It is abundantly clear that the record of this government is a record of failure.

What is even worse, Mr. Speaker, is that the government refuses to come to grips with these problems. This is a majority government, so there will not be an election for at least another four years. The way the Prime Minister operates, however, he will probably hang in until the last minute, so it could be five years before there is an election. Why would the government not be courageous and tackle these problems head on? The longer the problems are shoved under the carpet, the worse they will get. There is no excuse for the government not endeavouring to do something to diminish the severity of these problems.

It is interesting to note what the Prime Minister had to say during the last election campaign. He promised energy prices below those proposed in the Progressive Conservative government's budget. It is estimated that over four years the difference will be five cents per gallon. Of course the Prime Minister would have Canadians believe this government's increase is considerably less than that which would have occurred under the Progressive Conservative budget last December.

Since this government took office eight months ago, there have been no less than five increases in the price of gasoline. This is the government that promised to keep energy prices down. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the few short months the Liberals have been in office they have presided over price increases at the gasoline pump totalling, in central and western Canada, 14.8 cents per gallon, and in eastern Canada 15.5 cents per gallon. I think that is ironic, because I recall very well that a year ago gasoline cost \$1 or slightly under. Just