

aware that, in order to fight those highly inflated pressures, all governments would have had to introduce stronger monetary and fiscal controls in an effort to keep down the rate of inflation?

I have heard the hon. member and other members of the Tory opposition speak with great fondness of the economic posture taken by the Conservative Party in Great Britain. Does he know that the unemployment rate in Great Britain today is 11.3 per cent, 4 per cent higher than ours? That is the result of the very kinds of policies that are advocated by the hon. member for York-whatever-it-is, the "hon. slasher" and other members, in the Crosbie budget.

I have heard the hon. member for Calgary West speak at great length about the injustices of the National Energy Program. He said it is going to ruin the economy. Let me point out for his interest a second statistical fact, that every time a dollar is added to the price of a barrel of oil, it has an impact of 0.1 per cent reduction in the employment growth of this country. That adds up to 11,000 jobs. If we compare the pricing put forward in our National Energy Program with the proposal advanced in the Crosbie budget, we see that we would have had an additional 140,000 people unemployed in this country by 1984. This is the kind of hypocrisy and double standard that hon. members opposite are trying to perpetuate. They proposed an economic policy that would lead to higher unemployment, less sharing of the wealth of this country, and a greater and more serious impact upon the non-oil producing areas.

Let me point out another fact which I frankly find funny. The hon. member for Calgary West has a hobby-horse that he rides about the growth in public service employment. Day in and day out he castigates this awful federal government for adding to the employment rolls of the public service and letting the private sector go free. If he were to look at the Statistics Canada reports a little more carefully, he would see that the growth rate in the public service at the federal level was 1.5 per cent. The real growth in public service employment came from the provincial governments. Over the last quarter it reached 14 per cent. It was the provincial premiers, upon whom he daily lavishes his fondness, who contributed to the growth of the public service in Canada of 14 per cent versus the federal 1.5 per cent.

● (1600)

It is time we got down to the real facts and realized what is taking place regarding the employment situation in this country. It is time we forgot the fol-de-rol and the fog which the hon. member from Calgary is trying to create. He stands in this House with all the drama at his command and says "Think of the poor people in Prince Edward Island. Think what they face today as they go to the polls, comparing the records of the Liberal and Conservative governments."

I would like to make one comparison which the people in Prince Edward Island, I think, would find interesting. It was the Conservative government which cancelled and decimated the direct employment programs which provided hundreds of

Unemployment

jobs for people in Prince Edward Island. In fact, close to \$45 million has been spent this year alone in direct employment grants. This has provided for the development of new wharves and harbours and new programs for long-range economic development. As well, it has provided for the introduction of the new, innovative program to develop long-term community employment.

That is what the people of Prince Edward Island gained by the defeat of the Conservative government a year ago. They gained the assistance of government in ensuring there would be employment wherever it was necessary. The Conservative government cancelled the direct employment programs which are absolutely necessary in the provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, northern Manitoba and northern Alberta. If the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) had asked for more money to create jobs for the Indian bands, he would have been in a sorry pickle if there had been a Conservative government sitting on this side, because there was no program from which he could have received money.

Let us not get involved in this great gnashing of teeth; instead, let us get down to the real issue of employment, which is: How do we direct government programs in the most effective way? That is the question. The hon. member for Hamilton-Mountain said that we do not have a plan of action, that there is nothing there.

Miss MacDonald: That is absolutely right.

Mr. Axworthy: I take issue with the hon. member for Hamilton-Mountain and point out to him how we have a well devised strategy, one on which we are working and which is having success. It is pointing in the direction we have to go in the 1980s. We have tried to do a careful analysis of who it is that is unemployed. The hon. member from Calgary kept talking about the other person in his block. In Alberta that is not much of a problem because the unemployment rate there is 4.1 per cent. For males over 25 in Canada the unemployment rate in Alberta is only 4.5 per cent. By most economist's standards, that is virtually full employment within that specific group. You must take into account that a lot of people change jobs.

Mr. McDermid: Changing jobs?

Mr. Axworthy: The hon. member from Brampton obviously has economic training, which is something to be desired. He should know that each month 300,000 people come into the work force and 300,000 people leave the work force. People do change jobs, you know. They look for improvement. They provide for new opportunities. People try to go where the jobs are. There is obviously a constant flow in and out of the unemployment ranks.

The hon. member talks with great pride about his government's record concerning jobs for women. I will tell the House what our record is. His mathematics are not very good. We created 182,000 jobs in the last 12 months; in other words, 15,000 jobs per month for women in Canada.