

know the Leader of the Opposition was very familiar with the problem of unemployment in the maritimes during those years. In 1958 the rate of unemployment was 12.3 per cent; in 1959, 10.9 per cent; in 1960, 10.5 per cent; in 1961, 11.2 per cent; in 1962, 10.7 per cent. When the Liberal party, under Mr. Pearson, came to office, we reduced unemployment in 1963 to 9.5 per cent; in 1964, to 7.8 per cent; in 1965, to 7.4 per cent; in 1966, to 6.4 per cent; in 1967, to 6.6 per cent; and in 1968 it went up half a point to 7.3 per cent. Let me point out again that in 1968 it was 7.3 per cent as compared, for instance, to 10.7 per cent when we took office in 1962 and to a high of 12.3 per cent in 1958. Again, this speaks well for the ability of the Liberal party to cope with the intolerable problem of unemployment.

Nobody is happy with unemployment. No one in this party says that 2, 3 or 4 per cent of unemployment is acceptable. Nobody that I know is quite that callous. But if we are going to be blamed for unemployment—and that is fair game because this is a debating arena, which is as it should be—if we are going to be accused of not providing enough jobs, then by the same token we should be given credit for the jobs that have been provided. Here I have some specific statistics which I am sure hon. members will wish to peruse at their leisure. In 1962, the total labour force totalled 6,615,000. In 1968 there were 7,919,000, a total increase of 1,304,000 people in Canada. We were able to find 1,312,000 jobs, thus reducing the rate of unemployment by almost 50 per cent of 1962. If we are to be blamed for not finding enough jobs, then I think we should be commended for finding over 1,300,000 jobs to look after the ever growing labour population of this country.

How were these jobs generated? There is no use for the Opposition or the New Democratic party saying that it was an accident and that these jobs would have become available by themselves. If we are going to use that argument, and it is said you cannot control the fabrication of jobs, then we cannot be accused of not providing sufficient jobs. We cannot have it both ways, as the New Democratic party seems to want.

If time permits I may point out that between 1963 and 1968 we did a lot of things in this party to create jobs. We are faced with the fact that Canada's problem is unique in the western world if only because of its vast size, the geographical problem of the Atlantic region and the western areas. The fact that

*Alleged Failure to Reduce Unemployment*  
we are underpopulated is a fact of life. So is the fact that we thus cannot generate a large domestic market and thus we must compete at a growing pace for exports, despite the fact that we have the tremendous problem of transportation in a country of this dimension.

We set up the Economic Council, to which everyone in the house alludes as to a bible. It is a source of reference probably for most of the speeches that have been made or will be made in this debate. It was the foresight of the former prime minister, Mr. Pearson, to establish this council and to name the responsible people which form it. Then, we were able to set up the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce which, for instance, had enough foresight to establish the auto pact which in turn generated directly almost 50,000 jobs and God knows how many jobs indirectly in this country. Yet the New Democratic party and other members of the house accuse us of having no vision and of not planning for tomorrow or for the next day. We put some money into the Atlantic Development Board which had not been done before, in fact \$100 million more than had been made available. We activated the FRED program, and we gave ARDA new dimensions and a new scope. We took an exceptionally fine idea and we applied it to regional programs. All these things have resulted in one million and three hundred new jobs. But we have done more than that. We have analysed the reasons for unemployment. This is very important. I have some statistics which would be useful to members of the house who are objective about the problem of unemployment. We set up the Department of Manpower as distinct from the Department of Labour and we did this for a good reason. It was very obvious to those people who studied the problem of the chronic unemployed and who realized the geographical problems of this country that to a tremendous degree, Canada was suffering from a lack of money in the field of education during the depression days and this has affected, more than people realize, those who are out of work today in the 50 and 55 age bracket. These people were not able to continue their education during the depression. They then served the country in the war years and now are faced with the uncertainties of technological change and the insecurity of jobs disappearing overnight.

Those people are not armed with the basic education needed to adjust to the new industries that spring up as a result of those same technological changes. Realizing the needs and complexities of this country and realizing