The Budget-Mr. Hawkes

nesses. For years, husbands and wives have been running small businesses and working long hours. The tax system has not encouraged that. The tax system has discouraged that. In terms of signalling a change in direction, that small provision, which is not at high cost to the taxpayers of Canada, is simply an expression of willingness on the part of this government to acknowledge the importance of husbands and wives working together to create businesses and economic futures for themselves. Owning a business frequently requires is not everybody's cup of tea, yet as a government we still wanted to encourage ownership.

The provisions in this budget which address themselves to the issue of common stocks and related matters, I think, are an encouragement to all Canadians to invest in enterprises inside Canada. If you do not feel competent to run your own business, then this government wants to encourage you to put up part of the money and put it into the hands of somebody with the skill and drive to go out and make it grow through some other means. That is what the common stock provision is, and that relates to the issue of ownership.

The debenture bonds which will help relieve small business from the high cost of interest rates are interesting in two ways. It is a budgetary provision which is targeted to the principle of ownership, and it is a time limited provision. It is a step we need to take in this particular economic climate, but it is one which we hope a year or two down the road can disappear because it will no longer be needed as the government will be borrowing less money. The cost of money will go down, and we will all benefit from that.

The provisions related to capital gains on farms are another example of what I call the ownership philosophy which characterizes the budget which we heard last night.

The second major issue to which this budget addresses itself is something which professional economists would call the infra-structure concern, and we see its expression in the energy package. We see some words dedicated to the starting of an energy bank. In my city the words "energy bank" conjure up an image of oil and gas and their exploration. I want to say to the people in my riding that the words "energy" and "energy bank" in the Canadian context are much broader than that. We are talking about bringing substitute energy sources on stream so that individuals and corporations can have the kind of fuel which is indigenous to the regions of this country in economic terms so that they can go out and get the job done in the region.

• (1740)

Is my time up, Mr. Speaker? I will conclude very shortly. I have one idea which I would like to lay out for public debate and I hope that people will communicate with me on it. I think there is something psychologically damaging about the concept of unemployment insurance. I would like to throw out into the public arena of policy debate the whole concept of employment insurance. I believe the key word in both instances is insurance, and I think the steps in last night's budget move us closer [Mr. Hawkes.]

to the reality of the insurance principle. But I think there is something psychologically damaging to the recipients of insurance payments when we say to them, "You cannot work, you cannot do things that are socially useful the way your friends and neighbours do." I would like us to begin to engage in a debate on a fundamental change in relation to that program in the direction of employment insurance. I would caution members of the House and members of the government that such a fundamental change should not be entered into hastily, but I think it is an issue that we might well support over the next year or two. Thank you for your attention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

Mr. Dennis Dawson (Louis-Hébert): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to participate in this debate on this budget which is the first and, I hope, the last one of the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie). It would have been more interesting even for the new member to speak on a budget with positive points. The hon. member even admitted to participating a few years ago in drafting the economic policy of the Progressive Conservative party, so I think he might have been better off keeping his mouth shut.

That is not so, Mr. Speaker, no, there is nothing in this budget to talk about, nothing to give Quebeckers and Canadians generally the least impression that there is something progressive in that so-called Progressive Conservative party. I would have liked to see the hon. member talk of job creation. Unfortunately, we heard nothing or nearly nothing about that, Mr. Speaker. In a speech that lasted over an hour, there were 30 seconds on job creation. One paragraph out of 25 pages, Mr. Speaker.

Not only nothing in terms of job creation, but in addition there are measures harmful to job creation in Canada. The rise in the price of gasoline, Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out by the critics of this budget, is going to create at least 100,000 more unemployed. If you add to that the other harmful measures in this budget, we will have at least 150,000 new unemployed. I could talk at length about the absence of concrete measures in the budget to protect the purchasing power of older people. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing, only higher transportation costs and unemployment. Nothing for pensioners. They will have to pay more to travel within their cities. They will have less purchasing power because inflation will probably reach 10 and 11 per cent. There will be less money for food and less money for clothing.

What about workers, Mr. Speaker? Workers will see in this budget an increase in their transportation costs to get to work, an increase in their contributions to unemployment insurance so that at the end of the week they will end up with a loss of at least 2 or 3 per cent on their regular salaries as a result of the budget measures alone, not to say anything about inflation. Before this budget, these same workers, these same unem-