

Supply—Labour

that this is not a debatable motion. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Chevrier: No, no. We are against it.

An hon. Member: It is about time you woke up.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Then I shall put the motion.

Mr. Chevrier: This is a shame.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Churchill) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Macdonald, Mrs.
Allard	MacEwan
Balcer	MacLean (Queens)
Baldwin	MacRae
Bell (Carleton)	McBain
Bell (Saint John-Albert)	McCleave
Browne (St. John's West)	McFarlane
Brunsdon	McGrath
Cadieu	McPhillips
Campbell	McQuillan
(Lambton-Kent)	Mandziuk
Campbell (Stormont)	Matthews
Cardiff	Milligan
Casselman, Mrs.	Montgomery
Chambers	More
Charlton	Muir (Cape Breton
Chatterton	North and Victoria)
Churchill	Muir (Lisgar)
Clancy	Nasserden
Coates	Nugent
Creaghan	O'Leary
Crouse	Ormiston
Danforth	Pallett
Dinsdale	Pascoe
English	Payne
Fairclough, Mrs.	Phillips
Fane	Rapp
Flemming (Royal)	Regnier
Flynn	Simpson
Forbes	Skoreyko
Fulton	Slogan
Grafftey	Smallwood
Gundlock	Smith (Lincoln)
Hamilton (Notre Dame	Smith (Winnipeg North)
de Grace)	Southern
Hees	Spencer
Henderson	Starr
Hicks	Stewart
Kennedy	Taylor
Kindt	Thrasher
Korchinski	Tremblay
Lambert	Walker
LaRue	Woolliams—84.
Letourneau	

NAYS

Messrs:

Badanal	Dupuis
Batten	Eudes
Brassard (Lapointe)	Habel
Carter	Hellyer
Chevrier	Herridge
Clermont	Leduc
Denis	McIlraith

[Mr. Speaker.]

McMillan
Martin (Timmins)
Peters
Pickersgill
Regier

Richard (Ottawa East)
Rouleau
Tardif
Tucker
Winch—24.

And the house having resumed in committee:

Mr. McMillan: I am sorry to have had my remarks interrupted in the way in which they were. I did not mean to refer to Cornwall more than any other place that had a lot of unemployment and welfare because of the policies of this government. I know the hon. member for Stormont is very industrious and I believe his work here in this house should be directed towards overcoming that condition in his constituency, as we have been trying to do all along because of what we think has been the futility of the government's policy in overcoming unemployment.

Today we are asked to vote \$25 million, and we are asked to vote it for two basic reasons. One is that for a long time the government did not admit that unemployment was a problem at all and, when they did, they did little or nothing to come to grips with it. The second reason is because of investment losses in the unemployment insurance fund.

The fiscal policies of the government could not be much better devised to cause high interest rates, stagnation in our economy, and unemployment. They could not be much better devised also to cause losses on securities held in that fund. They certainly depressed the value of bonds and other securities in the portfolio of the fund. Now the government try to evade responsibility for unemployment and for the investment losses in that fund, but they must take responsibility for both.

The unemployment insurance fund was built up to \$928 million under the former government but this government have depleted practically all of it. The mere presence of the fund and the fact that this government could fall back on it to cushion the effect of unemployment has caused the government to take a laissez faire attitude towards many problems. In fact the government have just coasted along, depending on that money. I hate to think what would have happened if this fund had not been in existence. Undoubtedly the public would have been very vocal and the government would have long since started to snap out of their present lethargy.

The government have not been frank with hon. members regarding the unemployment insurance fund and I do not think the minister was frank today. He did not give us many figures at all. The advisory committee of the fund brought in a special report on October 27, 1960. The government kept that report for