

*The Budget—Mr. A. Caouette*

Mr. Speaker, as for the Local Initiatives Program, it would have been in the interests of the government to invest in it much more, to assist the municipalities to carry out some works and thus create jobs. Unemployment insurance and social welfare are quite useful in some cases, but why let so many employable persons remain idle when municipalities could make them work throughout the year? Why could they not, while receiving benefits, serve the community and for those who have lost their job redevelop a taste for work? Those are the points which the minister should have considered and included in his budget.

Mr. Speaker, in the meantime what happens to the small wage earner? The government makes him again carry the can and then we wonder why there are so many strikes and workers are never happy. The last budget is one of the reasons. The government in its budget refrains from dealing directly with the problems of unemployment insurance. It did not even refer to them and does not tackle the waiting period. It is an undue penalty. It does not even create a more effective organization to pay more quickly the benefits to people who are entitled to them. The exclusion from three to six weeks will give cause for reflection to many of those who want to leave their job without valid reason. But what will those persons live on during those six weeks? Probably on allowances from the Department of Social Affairs, because we cannot let children starve when their father left his job without reason. The worker on sick leave after a short period of work will need 20 more insurable employment weeks to draw benefits and there will be four more weeks without benefits to disqualify people and reach the disqualification objective.

Mr. Speaker, all those things should have been studied and included in this budget for the advantage of all Canadians. The guaranteed annual income advocated by the Social Credit Party of Canada should have been a feature of this budget. For many years, Canadians have been asking for that. But nothing in this budget is for the low wage earner. Everything is against him. Nor can we see anything in this budget for the moderate income group. And given the present economic conditions and the lack of solutions in this budget, there is no indication at all for better days in the future.

No other solution is brought to inflation, to recession or to unemployment. According to the Minister of Finance, recent polls have been made. According to these polls, the majority of Canadians feel they live better now than a year ago. I wonder in which class of society these polls have been made. Certainly not among those on welfare or among senior citizens, and still less among mine workers or forestry workers.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, with this budget, the minister brings no solution to the problems facing Canadians. It is inflationary and it creates further problems for these in low income brackets. The government will not settle their problems by reducing the purchasing power of the citizens. For a long time, since its inception, the Social Credit Party continuously brings good solutions to the problems facing the Canadian people but the government turns a deaf ear. The budget brought down on June 23 is a glaring evidence of that. It is very sad for Canadians that this is a

[Mr. Caouette (Villeneuve).]

majority government; otherwise, it would probably have had quite a surprise.

[English]

An hon. Member: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I have no objection to recognizing either of the hon. members, but I would draw attention to the fact that whoever speaks at this time will not be able to speak tomorrow; the question having been put, the debate tomorrow will be on the main motion. If they are content to speak for four minutes without completing the 30 minutes which might otherwise be allotted to them, I have no objection. It is their choice. On the other hand, I could call the question.

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.  
*And more than five members having risen:*

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Stevens) which was negated on the following division:

● (1740)

*(Division No. 55)*

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander	Coates	Hees
Alkenbrack	Cossitt	Hnatyshyn
Allard	Darling	Hogan
Andre	Dick	Holmes
(Calgary Centre)	Diefenbaker	Horner
Baker	Dinsdale	Huntington
(Grenville-Carleton)	Dionne	Hurlburt
Baldwin	(Kamouraska)	Jarvis
Balfour	Douglas	Jelinek
Beatty	(Nanaimo-Cowichan-	Jones
Beaudoin	The Islands)	Kempling
Benjamin	Ellis	Knowles
Blackburn	Epp	(Winnipeg
Brewin	Fairweather	North Centre)
Caouette	Friesen	Knowles
(Villeneuve)	Gilbert	(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Carter	Gillies	Lambert
Clark	Grafftey	(Edmonton West)
(Rocky Mountain)	Halliday	La Salle
Clarke	Hamilton	Lawrence
(Vancouver Quadra)	(Qu'Appelle-Moose	Leggatt
	Mountain)	