

go to those people who need it most, those in the lower-income groups. It will find its way into consumer purchases immediately and afford a stimulation to the economy. This is far more positive than talking about sending cheques to the municipalities to relieve their costs of social assistance, with no guarantee that the money will go to those who need help.

It might also be pointed out that relative to what we are suggesting in the FISP program, the alternative to the family allowance, we are now talking about redirecting at least \$250 million in that system toward the lower-income group. The income supplementation that the families in the lower levels receive will be tripled. I am talking in terms of people who earn under \$4,500 a year receiving \$16 a month. When the additional expenditure of \$200 million going to the guaranteed income supplement is combined with the approximately \$200 million to \$300 million that will be distributed through an alteration in FISP, there is the potentiality of half a billion dollars going to the lower-income group, the people who desperately need it. They will immediately spend it on consumer goods, which will result in a positive stimulation to the economy.

Mr. McCutcheon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order on behalf of my colleague, the hon. member from Essex, who is most anxious that a clipping he has been delivered to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is hardly a point of order. Perhaps I should indicate to the House that I understand there is an informal agreement that the minister will not take all his time, in order to allow a representative of the Créditiste party to speak.

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that the agreement exists. Having said what I have already said, which has obviously passed the attention of the opposition, I hope that during the course of the next few days we might hear more constructive suggestions on how to cope with the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) would like to ask a question. He can ask a question and the minister can reply, but I bring to the attention of the hon. member and the minister that there is agreement that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) should be given an opportunity to speak in the last ten minutes.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister indicated he will accept the question. I guarantee it will be short; however, the length of the answer is something else. Will the minister give the House the government's definition of the word "guaranteed"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to rise and protect the interests of the minority who has been trying to get the floor for a while.

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you very much and very sincerely for the protec-

Alleged Non-Support of Employment Programs

tion you give minority groups in the House. At the end of a debate on a question that affects us so deeply, when only one member of our party has had the opportunity to express our viewpoint, obviously we feel rather neglected and rightly so. Happily, your intervention allows us to close on a Créditiste note a debate that has dragged on interminably because of negativism.

Considering I have not much time left and since the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras) have said that the opposition did not propose any positive solution to check unemployment, I want to set the record straight.

Not only is that not true, but those who heard the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) know full well that he made several suggestions that could remedy the situation. But it seems his words fell on dry, rocky terrain, in short, on deaf ears, for the government members have done their utmost to say that we have proposed no solution.

In fact, I should like to bring up one of them again. In so doing, I shall use the same language and the same material the liberal members have used.

Recently, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) published a liberal brochure, with the taxpayers' money, entitled, "How your Tax Dollar is Spent", and this to encourage people to pay more taxes, under the pretext that this money is supposedly well managed! In this brochure, it is stated that for each tax dollar that is drawn from the pockets of the taxpayer, 14 cents are affected to the payment of public debts. Why? So as to pay interests to our creditors. On page 23, one can read the following:

Canada's public debt amounted to \$38 billion in October, 1970, and the Minister of Finance has forecast new government borrowings of \$1.9 billion in 1971-72—

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will get down on his knees before foreign financiers to borrow two billion, without the agreement of this House, without consulting us. He will go, on his own, and contribute to selling another part of Canada for another \$2 billion, in short, for a pittance. On what terms? For an excessive rate of interest. Why? To develop our country? As the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste said this afternoon, we do have manpower, resources, unemployed workers—by the way, this government does not know what to do with them anymore—in short we have all that we need in Canada, but no money. So, we will go "on all fours" before Big Business and fetch \$2 billion for 1971-72.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is even more shameful, not only is it bad management but it is obviously a raw deal.

So that the people will swallow the pill, they are told at page 24 of the same booklet that, this year, \$2 billion will be borrowed at an interest rate of 8 or 9 per cent from foreign bankers. This is what is said:

This interest payment is almost wholly a return on investments in Canada by Canadians.