

Supply

Canadian worker produces around \$54,000 worth of output per year. That same Toronto-Dominion Bank study says that if we were to cut our unemployment rate by half, in other words by 575,000 people, and multiply that by \$54,000 per year, we would have an extra output of \$31 billion per year or 5 per cent more in terms of output in this economy. This is a study by a fairly conservative organization, the Toronto-Dominion Bank.

I think Canadian people should realize what this means. The average worker produces around \$54,000 per year in output. This is not somebody who is working at a very high salaried job and producing all kinds of goods and services or somebody who is at the low end of the scale. This is the average per worker, \$54,000 per year. If we had an unemployment rate that was down around the level of western Europeans or Scandinavians, that is an extra \$31 billion per year. Just think what we could do with \$31 billion per year. That is a lot of money in terms of the government's deficit, in terms of educational and health services, in terms of research and development, and in terms of making our economy more productive, more humane and more equal for Canadians across this land.

It is not only the benefits of \$31 billion per year, but let us imagine the costs of having over one million Canadians unemployed, the money that we spend for unemployment insurance benefits every year. The money that is spent by the federal and provincial governments on social welfare and social services is astronomical. We do not even have a proper mechanism of calculating the other costs to health care. How much does it cost our country in terms of additional health care every year because we have an army of over a million unemployed? What does it cost in terms of higher crime rates in this country or the unhappiness that people suffer through because they do not have a job, and a proper mechanism to feed their families?

I think this government would be serving this country well if we would devise a way of calculating the cost of high unemployment so we could see what the costs of this country are and see what the cost to the individual is of an unemployment rate of over a million per year in Canada.

With these kinds of statistics, I think it is about time that this government devised a policy that has as its

number one objective full employment in Canada. I do not see that happening when I look across the way.

This country, in terms of job creation and in terms of money it spends on unemployment, tends to spend most of its money on things like unemployment insurance and welfare benefits and social benefits rather than spending money creating jobs. In Sweden, for example, around 2.38 per cent of the Gross Domestic Product of that country is spent in labour market programs. In this country it is around 2.1 per cent, a little less but not much less.

However in terms of how they spend it, it becomes very interesting. In Sweden about 71 per cent of the money goes into training, counselling, and other programs to get Swedes working. Around 29 per cent goes into stay at home unemployment insurance benefits. In this country it is the opposite way around. We spend 76 per cent on things like UI and benefits to the unemployed, and about 24 per cent on structural changes to create jobs.

The minister says that is a very valid criticism, and I agree. We should be changing that. I fully agree with the minister that we should be changing that and spending a lot more of our resources and a lot more of our creativity trying to create long-term jobs for workers. That historically has not been the case, and that is a valid criticism that has been made by a number of people, including I believe the Economic Council of Canada.

It is not just the government of this country that seems to be spending too little money in trying to find decent jobs and training people, but the business community is doing the same. My understanding is that the business community spends about 0.5 per cent of its payroll on training people, one-half of one per cent on training people. The United States to the south of us spends about 1 per cent, which is around double, in terms of training people.

The American economy is not going that hot either. The Americans have unemployment rates much higher than the Scandinavians or the western Europeans or the Japanese. However, in the United States they spend twice as much in the private sector in terms of training people for the jobs in a modern industrialized society.

Of course the federal government is, in relative terms, cutting back on spending in terms of retraining and counselling for people who are out there in the labour market. These are some of the facts we should be