

tion—we would presume—that education and retraining can be purchased in the same perfunctory way the housewife buys her weekly groceries.

The major criticism in this report, and it holds true today just as it did a year ago, is that the forecasting, planning and training arrangements are grotesquely inadequate. For this, the minister must bear the responsibility. There is no effective co-operation between the federal government, which is responsible for the executive and financial aspects of the training, and the provincial governments which provide the facilities. In short, there is no integration of planning. The result is that countless Canadians are being trained for jobs which do not exist, while jobs which do exist go unfilled for lack of trained people. The result is we see in our ridings hundreds of unemployed people entering courses to be trained as plumbers, or electricians or bricklayers in the full expectation that when they complete their training they will be able to find jobs. But no jobs exist for them because the economic forecasting has been inadequate; the planning has either been non-existent or carried out in a slipshod fashion.

I should like the minister to provide the House with some information enabling us to compare the efficacy of our manpower training program with those of Sweden and Japan, for example. I should like him also to produce figures relating to the economic productivity in those countries as compared with our own. I believe, then, he would be able to appreciate the solid advantages of an effective manpower training program. The point is that manpower retraining represents no net cost to the people of Canada in the long run because it leads to a more productive labour force. There have, of course, been some good results flowing from manpower retraining—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**An hon. Member:** Carry on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Does the House give permission to the hon. member to continue his remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I thank hon. members. The point I was making initially was that the general economic direction the government is taking is bad, that it is a major source of disunity in this country, that it could lead to clashes between worker and worker, between French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians. This danger should not be under-estimated. I tried to show that if the government were to seize on one major economic objective to provide a large number of jobs and simultaneously deal with a serious social concern, it should embark on a housing program the like of which this country has never seen, one which would result by the year 1980 in housing having become a social right just as secondary education is now assumed to be a right.

I look forward to hearing the observations of whichever ministers intend to take part in the debate. I shall be

### *Employment Programs*

curious to see whether they are prepared to meet the challenge which lies before us or to follow the example of two of their former colleagues who recently decided that, because of their interest in these matters and their concern for the average Canadian, they ought to leave the ministry.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, this motion proposed by the opposition once more points out how important it is for the government to solve the unemployment problem, to find solutions for the economic and financial problems facing us. Thus we have an opportunity to express in the House the more and more widespread dissatisfaction among the Canadian people, especially in Quebec, and particularly in my own area of the St. Maurice valley.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot insist enough on the urgency of that situation and we cannot stress enough how pressing it is to find not palliatives but final solutions for these problems which affect our people.

Through what we read in newspapers and hear and see on radio and television we notice that everybody deplors the present situation. More and more frequently newspaper headlines point out the seriousness of the situation: "Nine thousand additional unemployed" proclaimed a headline some weeks ago. "The biggest increase in unemployment in 13 years". "Quebec still leads", wrote another newspaper later. "23,000 more unemployed in the province in 1970."

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, how far this is from the promises made in the spring of 1970 by the present premier of Quebec!

In a newspaper, one could read: "17,000 Montrealers laid off in 1970."

In its January 13, 1971 issue, *La Presse* published an article headlined "Only 10,000 new jobs last year."

For the past few months, Mr. Speaker, newspapers have been full of this type of headlines.

In the face of this situation, what argument has been advanced, what were the solutions advocated?

A Canadian Press feature on May 8, 1971 stated regarding unemployment: "Trudeau admits failure."

Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to quote this excerpt from the Canadian Press:

The Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, said last night that unemployment had been the most serious failure of his government during its three years in office.

The Prime Minister, interviewed on the C.B.C. television program "Format 60", admitted that unemployment was partly due to the fight against inflation which his government waged last year and won, in his opinion.

"The fight against inflation has been a success but it has contributed to the unfortunate increase of unemployment," he said.

The Prime Minister, who was interviewed by reporters, maintained that the government however had to check inflation to attain the objectives of the just society.

According to him, it is generally the small worker, the widow, the mother, the welfare case who are the victims of inflation since they get less for their dollar then.