

Mr. Leggatt: Hang on, I think that you just might. I am glad the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said that he did not get a hernia. I would like to point out to hon. members what the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said in his speech, as reported at page 991 of *Hansard*, November 9, 1978:

Another thing which the minister did not do was attack the basic problem. In the abuses and overspending of the unemployment insurance account, the basic problem is payments made to people who quit their jobs because they would rather go on unemployment insurance—

That does not sound very much like the hon. member for St. John's East. He goes on:

The reduction of the payment rate to 60 per cent from two-thirds has not changed. It has the same effective date of January 1. But the government seems to have overlooked in that reduction that for some people two-thirds of the wage is closer to a necessity, and 60 per cent to some at the other end of the scale is still more than adequate for an amount to be paid for not working.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the real Tory philosophy, and if they have the courage of their convictions they will vote with the government on this bill, in accordance with that well expressed, right wing, Milton Friedman, William F. Buckley philosophy.

At another point in his speech the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra says:

Given the climate of restraint, Canadians were looking forward to the minister's statement on September 1; people were probably quite pleased to think the government was moving to cut down the unemployment insurance deficit—

On the same day as the minister made his statement I made a response for this party in which I noted that in our view the measures proposed by the minister were a step in the right direction.

I suspect that my colleague from Vancouver Quadra did not think that they had gone far enough. I will wait and see how he votes on the bill and how the rest of the Conservative party votes on the bill. I suspect that their heart is not quite in this one. I can see a few members whom I would put in the red Tory category, who have fought and won a good fight, and they are happy and smiling tonight. I am pleased to see that.

This particular subject is treated as though it were impossible to provide full employment. Even a country as capitalistic as the United States has had the courage to propose full employment legislation. It was proposed by the late Senator Humphrey, and it still sits before Congress. Nevertheless, there is some hope and a realization there that the public sector must be used to create employment. Where is the bill before this House which suggests we need full employment? Where is the courage of the government which says we are willing to use the fiscal tools in order to guarantee employment? One thing we all know in this House is that a man who comes to pick up his unemployment cheque should not get it, instead he should get a job. However, how can this man get a job when there are 17 other people looking for the same job?

This government simply does not have the will to sit down and plan this economy for full employment. The problems in this House which spin off into our criminal justice legislation and the great social problems of this country are directly related because a significant section of the population is told,

Unemployment Insurance Act

"We don't want you. We don't have a job for you. We have no use for you, so forget it. Here is a hand-out." That hand-out will take the form of welfare or unemployment insurance.

There has been so much talk about abuses of the unemployment insurance program. The way to stop that would be for the government simply to say that, "you are guaranteed a job." There is much work to do in this country. There are literally hundreds of thousands of things that need to be done and which the private sector cannot do because it is not geared up to handle the job, or it is not profitable for it. The consumer spin-off from such a program would begin to reduce the deficit everybody talks about, because it generates extra revenue, which in turn has an impact on the economy.

I can understand the government feeling that it is in a corner. I can understand it saying, "We have borrowed the last buck and we don't want to borrow any more from the money-lenders in New York." This policy, however, will only further increase that deficit. It cannot attack that deficit with the Friedman restraint policy. Revenues must be generated within society to pay that tax and, most importantly, it must be done by taxing those who are capable of paying it.

I am sure we have all received letters in the last few days from small businessmen who are upset because of that change in the budget which tells them that they no longer have the tax loophole where they could incorporate as a small company. I say that those people should pay the same rate of tax as everybody else in this country. That measure was designed for small entrepreneurial businesses, not for professional people such as doctors or lawyers. People are constantly telling us, particularly middle class people, that others do not want to work. They say, "Look at the farms. There are all kinds of jobs out there. They could pick corn in the summer. What do they mean saying there are no jobs?"

• (2112)

I have a solution, Mr. Speaker. We need the doctor-lawyer volunteer farm brigade. Instead of flying to Hawaii and complaining about the loafers in Canada no longer doing a job every summer, let us take those doctors and lawyers, and members of parliament, to pick the fruit one summer. It would do us all good. Those doctors and lawyers are the ones who get heart conditions and are in terrible shape. We should get them all together and say, "Do not go to Florida or Hawaii. Let us all go out and bring in the produce of this country." Then we would not blame the poor farm worker for not wanting his miserable little minimum wage or his few cents per pound on the peas, carrots and strawberries. It would make a lot of farmers happy because they would love to see doctors, lawyers, MPs and everybody else get their hands a little dirty and have some fun in the sun. Instead of having them griping we could put them to work on a volunteer basis. I think this is a suggestion that needs very serious consideration, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Check it out with CUPE.

Mr. Leggatt: My hon. friend says check it out with CUPE. I have talked to CUPE about this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and