

colleagues, the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would draw to the attention of hon. members that we have come to the end of the question period. The hon. member is seeking a supplementary and will be recognized for that purpose. With the consent of the House, I will recognize rather quickly the hon. member for Verdun and the hon. member for Fraser Valley East.

Mr. Atkey: Mr. Speaker, I take it the question has been referred to the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice. I wonder if either of those hon. gentlemen could indicate to the House and to the public the charges and the names of the individuals charged with irregularities in the financing of student co-operative housing, and perhaps the disposition of the charges that have been laid at their instance or the instance of any of the provincial Attorneys General.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I know the investigation is well under way but I am not sure now whether charges have yet been laid.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ALLEGATION THAT BENEFITS CONSTITUTE DISINCENTIVE TO WORK—GOVERNMENT REACTION

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Verdun): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In light of the concern expressed earlier in a motion under Standing Order 43, and in light of the fact that in Ontario a person who is married, with two children, can draw considerably more income on welfare than on unemployment insurance, and the inference that unemployment insurance is a disincentive to the Canadian worker, can the minister tell me whether he has come to the conclusion that this is an insult to the integrity of the Canadian worker?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very definite exploitation by the actions of the few people who might on occasion have attempted to take advantage of the situation. The evidence certainly is that by far the vast majority of people are not taking illegitimate advantage of unemployment insurance and in fact wish to see it administered firmly and fairly. We think that the commission is doing a fine job in that way.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to appeal to hon. members as we have reached the end of the question period. I thought we might have a quick question from the hon. member for Verdun and the hon. member for Fraser Valley East. I know that hon. members realize we are operating on short time, but there is to be a ringing of the bells later this afternoon and if we take too much time now we are denying hon. members a chance to participate in the important debate later this afternoon. I wonder if it

The Budget—Mr. Sharp

might not be better if we called orders of the day now. The hon. member is asking for a supplementary, and the hon. member for Fraser Valley East has been waiting for a few days to ask a question. The hon. member for Hamilton West has a question of privilege. If all will agree to wait until tomorrow, I will call orders of the day.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Alexander: No, Mr. Speaker; I just want to relate to you that I have forgone my question of privilege seeing that they are playing hanky-panky on the other side.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed, from Tuesday, May 7, consideration of the motion of Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance) that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; the amendment of Mr. Lambert, Edmonton West (p. 2105) and the amendment of Mr. Lewis (p. 2110).

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, at ten o'clock last evening when I called the hour for the adjournment of the debate I was dealing with the speech made by the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies). I should like to elaborate on the general point I was making at the time.

I listened with the greatest interest, along with my colleagues, waiting to find out what it was the Tory Party was putting up by way of alternatives to the policies proposed by my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner). I waited in vain, Mr. Speaker. May I say that on this particular occasion the burden of proof is quite different from that of an ordinary debate in this chamber. Under ordinary circumstances, when the government is in office the function of the opposition is to try to get government to defend its policies and to explain them. On this occasion, the purpose of the motions put forward by both opposition parties is to defeat the government, to go to the country and seek a mandate from the people. Under these circumstances, the opposition on both sides has an obligation to make it very clear to the public not only where the government has failed but what they would put in place by way of alternative policies.

Yesterday I listened carefully to the speech of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and particularly to that of the hon. member for Don Valley who represents the constituency next to mine and part of which I at one time represented. The hon. member for Don Valley is a very distinguished academic, a former professor. At one time I think he was chairman of the Economic Council of Ontario. With this background, I think we