

Unemployment Insurance Act

They cannot ask just one part of the nation to chip in, and allow the other part of the nation to go blithely on its way, getting all it can get. We need a 180-degree turn from the traditional and conventional wisdom of so-called private enterprise governments.

I do not ask the government to copy, imitate, or even pay attention to what we socialists are saying. I ask the government to take a leaf out of the book of private enterprise governments in a number of other countries. We cannot copy exactly what governments in other countries do. We must proceed according to our climate, geography, and economic situation. Only in this country and in the country to the south of us do we still cling to nineteenth century solutions and ideas in dealing with something which is entirely new in the economic history of mankind.

Clause 1 needs to be deleted. As a consequence, clause 14 should be deleted. The whole bill needs to be withdrawn. After January 23 the government should come back to us with a rewritten bill which would do some of the things we have been talking about. We can do it. The people and the wealth are there. They need to be challenged and mobilized. They need to be asked and directed. They need leadership in doing all the things which need to be done. That would do much to reduce deficits. It would do more to reduce our debt than any of the solutions proposed by the government and the official opposition. Can they not learn lessons from the histories of their own parties and of our country, let alone of other countries?

Surely by now the lessons of the 1890s to the 1960s should have told the government and the official opposition that we must make fundamental changes in managing our economy. This cannot be done just by the government, but the government has to lead. These changes require business, the trade union movement, the farm sector, the provinces and the municipalities to mount a massive effort under the leadership of a national government which is truly national. Unless and until we are prepared to make changes, we will continue to chop away at those who not only are not causing inflation and deficits but who instead are its first victims.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to when I have one minute left.

Unless and until investments are made, even with the knowledge that in the short run there would be deficit increases, we are not going to get out of the unemployment mess we are in, and our economy will not grow at a rate that is reasonable and proper, even if things are tough, comparatively speaking, in the rest of the world. That surely has to be done.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I must inform him that his allotted time has expired.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Janelle (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I too should like to bring my contribution to the discussion of the important bill before the House tonight. Having come to this House but a short time ago, I still had a few illusions: I thought that the federal Liberal party might perhaps have been touched by the hand of God. But I was sadly disappointed on nothing, since my election to this House, that it has brought in nothing but legislation that penalizes the disadvantaged.

The legislation we are discussing this evening will bring hardship upon several ridings of Canada, my own included. In my area, which depends mostly on soft sectors such as forestry and furniture, the rate of unemployment is rather high. Every week people come to my office complaining about the unemployment insurance program. The new amendments to the act will restrict access to benefits even further. And yet credits allotted to Canada Works projects by the same department were reduced to \$800,000 this year.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—PROGRESS IN FIELD OF BEHAVIOURAL MEDICINE

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, on November 2 I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) what progress in the field of behavioural medicine, the dream child of the previous minister, she could report. The minister's answer indicated an 8 per cent reduction in hospitalization between 1971 and 1975. That was a period in which there was the promotion of good health. I want to state that I am definitely in favour of preventive medicine and the keeping of records which show that we are on the right path.

The paths of the 1920s, the 1940s and the 1950s have come to an end because in those years we were dealing with the prevention of acute disease. The period from 1971 to 1975 was a period in which, as I said, there was the promotion of good health. Since statistics were compiled in those years, I would like to know in what areas we were most successful and between which guidelines we were operating. I would like to know what diseases were prevented by the specific measures which were taken. I would like to know what those specific measures were, as well as figures relating to the decrease in morbidity as well as figures relating to mortality.