

those 10 municipalities means employment ranging from an estimated maximum of 120 people to be employed in the city of Sudbury to an estimated maximum of 10 people to be employed in the city of North Bay. The total number of people it is expected will be employed in this program throughout the whole area is 524.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** For how many days will they be employed?

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** I do not have that information. A total of 524, it is expected, will be provided employment of some kind in this area. To point out how inadequate the program is to meet the situation, let us compare it with the announcement we saw in all the newspapers the other day to the effect that between 3,000 and 4,000 men are going to be thrown out of work in the municipality of Elliot Lake alone. That is in addition to the present number of unemployed with which the winter works program is supposed to cope.

It is also significant that in glancing at the list of municipalities which will participate in the program we see not one job being provided in the federal ridings of Timmins, Timiskaming and Cochrane. I knew this to be a fact with respect to Timmins. I checked with the hon. members for Cochrane and Timiskaming and their information verified mine with respect to the communities in their ridings.

To underline how inadequate the program is let us consider the municipality of Port Arthur. According to the figures supplied by the minister today, through this winter works program they hope to employ a total of 60 persons in the city of Port Arthur this winter. As of February 12, the latest figure shows that there are 4,959 people out of work in Port Arthur. Fort William is doing a little better. They hope to put 102 back to work. The figures as of February 11 show that 3,267 people are unemployed in that city. A total of 162 people are to be put to work in those two municipalities out of a combined total of 8,266 unemployed as of February 11 and 12.

Let me turn to the over-all aspect of unemployment, which I was unable to do last week, and deal briefly with the over-all situation which faces us. Again we have the figure of 792,000, or almost 793,000, unemployed, which was given to us by the minister. These people are seeking employment at the present time. There are various figures, and hon. members and newspapers across the country have a great time bandying those figures back and forth, as though the statistics themselves were important. Something that we have overlooked so far

is that, based on the average family in Canada today, the 800,000 people mentioned by the minister affect around two million people, because each one of those statistics that we throw around so carelessly represents a member of a family, and each and every member of that family is just as vitally concerned as the statistic that we find in our newspapers and in our dominion bureau of statistics.

Possibly hon. members have seen an editorial and three letters in the *Globe and Mail* of today dealing with this problem of unemployment. It has been kicked around in the newspapers as well as in the House of Commons. There is one very significant sentence in the editorial. I think it is one that, at least from past performances, we must presume that the government subscribes to. It reads:

Canada does not have any recession or depression today.

Be that as it may, whether we have a recession, a depression or anything else you wish to call it, we still have, in the minister's own words, close to 800,000 people without jobs in this country. What are the causes of the situation we are facing today? Many of the government representatives like to describe it as seasonal unemployment. I should like to point out that some years ago the government took steps to cure the seasonal unemployment that we had in Canada which only happened because of weather conditions and so on, which place people temporarily out of work. It is my understanding that the reason we enacted unemployment insurance in this country was to look after this problem of seasonal unemployment. If we had a cure for this problem some years ago, how is it that now seasonal unemployment is supposed to be responsible for the whole thing?

When speaking a few moments ago an hon. member boasted about the fact that unemployment insurance had been extended to at least 52 weeks. Does that mean the government has realized that this is a problem they cannot solve and they are going to extend the duration of unemployment insurance for 52 weeks? Are we going to bring in a bill next year to extend it to five years and then 20 years? Is that the answer?

**Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Will the hon. member permit a question? Is the hon. member opposed to people staying on unemployment insurance longer when they are out of work?

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** If the hon. member will contain himself till the conclusion of my remarks he will have no doubt as to what I am opposed to and what I am in favour of. Another cause of the problem of unemployment with which we are faced in this