

children, and women. It never picks on the rich and powerful. The government is going to announce shortly what it intends to do to fight inflation, but what bothers me about the government's fight against inflation is that it is always fought on the backs of the poor. We have seen this in the elimination from the Unemployment Insurance Act of the over 65 year olds. We have seen it in the proposal now before the House to eliminate the dependency rate. We have seen it in the proposal to eliminate advance payments. I point out that 70 per cent of those who collect unemployment insurance earn less than \$6,000 a year, and it is against these poor people that these provisions are directed.

Although many of these arguments have been made before, it seems to me absolutely essential that they be made again and again. I have no respect for a government with the majority it has that uses its power in this way. The unemployment insurance program is a social program, not an insurance program at all. It is one of the most direct ways of transferring funds to those who earn the least amount.

I know one of my colleagues in the opposition also wishes to say a few words this evening, so at this point I will take my seat.

[Translation]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, during the few minutes we have left to discuss Bill C-69, which is very important for the class of workers over 65, let me, on behalf of the official opposition, ask the government to give benevolent consideration to citizens over 65. Many of them have come to see me in my constituency, and I am sure that similar representations have been made to government members, I would even say, to request government compassion, and to say how much they think it is important to defeat this amendment.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, and I sound the alarm at the last moment, because I am sure that hon. members from my province and from other provinces as well have made the same representations to beg for more understanding and compassion on the part of the government, which seems to be too hard on that class of people who not only deserve but are entitled to the continued enjoyment of unemployment insurance benefits. May I be allowed, Mr. Speaker, in the few seconds I have left, to appeal to the minister, to beg of him to understand the importance of being just towards them. My colleagues of the Social Credit Party, the NDP and the Progressive Conservative Party agree with me that it is unthinkable that we should stand alone on this side of the House, when I see people like the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy), who received representations from their ridings, but who did not even speak to this bill. Other hon. members on the government side did not even have the courage to ask the minister to understand. I see the hon. member for Laval—

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is limited, but allow me to cry out for help on behalf of those people of 65 or more. I ask the minister to understand the importance of cancelling this amendment that is unjust, discriminatory and unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, before—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Béchard: You hear the members of the opposition: it is a perpetual muzzle—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. member for Joliette a question—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is difficult for the Chair to make a decision concerning a point of order. Because of the din, we did not hear anything on this side of the House.

I shall call upon the hon. member to present his point of order after we have disposed of various questions.

Order. It being 9.15 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings pursuant to the provisions of the order which was passed today so that the House may proceed to the deferred votes concerning any motion aimed at amending Bill C-69, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971.

[English]

The question is on motion No. 1. Call in the members.

The House divided on motion No. 1 (Mr. Alexander), which was negated on the following division:

(Division No. 89)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander	Hamilton	Mitges
Alkenbrack	(Swift Current-	Muir
Allard	Maple Creek)	Munro
Baker	Hargrave	(Esquimalt-Saanich)
(Grenville-Carleton)	Hees	Murta
Baldwin	Hnatyshyn	Neil
Balfour	Howie	Nielsen
Bawden	Huntington	O'Sullivan
Beatty	Hurlburt	Paproski
Beaudoin	Jarvis	Patterson
Brisco	Jelinek	Peters
Cadieu	Kemping	Reynolds
Caouette	Knowles	Ritchie
(Villeneuve)	(Norfolk-Haldimand)	Roche
Caouette	Lambert	Rondeau
(Témiscamingue)	(Bellechasse)	Rynard
Clarke	Lambert	Schellenberger
(Vancouver Quadra)	(Edmonton West)	Scott
Cossitt	La Salle	Skoreyko
Crouse	MacDonald	Smith
Darling	(Egmont)	(Churchill)
Dick	MacLean	Stanfield
Dionne	Malone	Stewart
(Kamouraska)	Marshall	(Marquette)
Epp	McCain	Towers
Fairweather	McGrath	Wagner
Forrestall	McKenzie	Whiteway
Fortin	McKinley	Wise
Friesen	McKinnon	Woolliams—84
Halliday		

NAYS

Messrs.

Abbott	Andres	Bégin (Miss)
Allmand	(Lincoln)	Benjamin
Anderson	Appolloni (Mrs.)	Blackburn
Andras	Basford	Blais
(Port Arthur)	Béchard	Blaker