

Alleged Non-Support of Employment Programs

mine will lay off 350 employees. And this morning, I got a telephone call from the unemployment insurance office in Rouyn advising me that the Molybdenite mine of Lacorne will be laying off 180 people next week-end.

The Cadillac Moly mine has already closed down. Industries are folding up while the government sets up new departments to fight unemployment. What a joke! The more talk there is of fighting unemployment, the more unemployment is allowed to grow. New departments, such as the Department of the Environment, are set up to co-ordinate the activities of all other departments. There is a proposal to create the Canada Development Corporation in order to promote new industries while we cannot use what our industry, our farmers for instance, can produce. Why? Because no valid solution is brought forward.

And when we get a day such as today to set out our suggestions, we realize the lack of interest for a matter as fundamental as this one not only among members of Parliament but also among newsmen always looking for scandals and sensational news. A look at the press gallery is enough to note that there is only one man there and he is probably from the Canadian Press. There is no representative of the press nor of the CBC. When we deal with serious matters and can suggest solutions, nobody is there to hear us.

If we had announced this morning that we would discuss the trial of Paul Rose in Montreal, the gallery would be full to hear us speak about it. When we refer to economic solutions to problems now confronting us, the gallery is empty. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to see the behaviour of those people who claim that they inform the Canadian people. They took off as soon as we began discussing this non-confidence motion.

Mr. Speaker, the Cr ditistes tell the government once again that its solutions are ineffective. The government is not using the right means to solve the unemployment crisis. There is talk of increasing the purchasing power of the people. I read recently in *Le Petit Journal* of Montreal the following editorial signed by Mr. Maurice Roy, which I quote:

● (3:40 p.m.)

A shower of dollars.

The sixth part of the report of the inquiry commission on health and welfare recommends the payment of a guaranteed minimum income to all citizens, if Quebec succeeds in retrieving from Ottawa the income security systems.

In short, this is social credit in disguise.

It is not I who wrote that, but Mr. Maurice Roy. I keep on quoting:

The same proposal, advocated for a long time by Mr. R al Caouette, was considered utopic. One must try to understand now why granting \$2,000 to single persons and \$3,400 to married couples is not utopic anymore. By the way, let me remind you that R al Caouette has never cost as much to taxpayers as the works of the health and welfare commission. Learned economists suggest that the payment of a guaranteed income would contribute to the stimulation of economy.

For the past thirty years now, we have been suggesting an increase in the purchasing power of Canadians, so as

[Mr. Caouette.]

to stimulate the Canadian economy. The economists as well as the government said that we were preaching something utopian. And now, they do recognize the fact that a yearly guaranteed income would contribute to stimulate the economy.

I go on with my quotation:

Maybe but on the condition that money should be properly spent. Would this shower of dollars on people help them to work? Maybe but at the present time, many recipients would rather stay home because it is paying off.

Given all these problems, a second enquiry commission will probably have to be appointed in order to implement the recommendations of the first one.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Maurice Roy indicates that this is social credit in disguise because the proposals of the commission tend to apply measures aimed at taking money from the wealthy in order to give it to the destitute, which is exactly contrary to social credit.

What does the social credit advocate? The party advocates a minimum vital requirement, which is the annual guaranteed income, not to be taken from the pockets of those who do own something, but to be provided by Canada's immense resources, by resorting to the funds of the Bank of Canada, by setting up the funds required just as the people of Canada are able to create goods and services in Canada. To the same extent that Canadians are able to develop their country, it is the government's duty to use the services of our financial institution called the Bank of Canada.

We would then respect the assets of those who have something, and would deprive none. Canada can afford to give something to everyone. It is a fact that the population as a whole, besides spending its whole income, the national annual income, is indebted to finance companies by \$12 billion. Why? Because Canadians do not have the purchasing power required to acquire existing products. Why are factories closing down? The management of Massey-Ferguson gave us the answer: We have too many machines, they said. Do we have too many machines? Do we have too much farm equipment or insufficient consumption? Let us find out from the farmers in Western Canada, in the central provinces, in the province of Quebec and in the Maritimes! If these people have all the farm equipment they need for their work, we will get an extraordinary market. Massey-Ferguson would have twice as many employees if they could sell the farm equipment they produce. What should the government do to solve the problem of lay-offs, of unemployment, of misery and so on? Several times we made proposals in the House.

We request, for instance, that all married persons with an annual income under \$5,000 be exempt from income tax. We request the same for single people earning less than \$3,000 a year.

When we ask that old age security pensions, widow pensions and disability pensions be increased to a minimum of \$150 a month, we shall be put down again for utopians, although this is only the way to increase the consumer's purchasing power.