

*Employment Programs*

● (5:50 p.m.)

We have found that those politicians who concentrated on attempting to alleviate the horrendous suffering from unemployment were, generally speaking, successful. It has been projected that this winter, out of a labour force of about 8,400,000 there will be a vast army of 750,000 to 800,000 men and women making a frustrating and disillusioning struggle for economic survival. In the Atlantic provinces the projected figure of unemployment is 18 per cent, in Quebec 12 per cent and Ontario is sneaking up to 6 per cent.

Donald MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, has said that as far as he is concerned unemployment this winter will be around 9 per cent, or 750,000 people. It does not matter to the man who is unemployed whether we talk about the seasonally adjusted rate, the unadjusted rate or any other rate; all he is concerned with is that he will be one of the 750,000 people out of work in and around the month of February. This is the situation to which we should direct our attention. What disturbs me is that the Prime Minister has indicated that such a rate has not been predicted by any responsible source.

**Mr. Olson:** Stick to the facts.

**Mr. Alexander:** I repeat what was said by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). He put on record some responsible views on this matter. For example, he mentioned Mr. Forrest Rogers, who is an economic adviser to the Bank of Nova Scotia. Mr. Rogers said that unemployment would be around 8½ per cent but he would not argue that we could not reach 9 per cent or even go beyond. Reference was also made to Professor Sidney Ingerman, a labour economist at McGill University, who said that the actual rate of unemployment nationally will be in the area of 9 per cent. The hon. member did not remember the prediction of Premier Ed Schreyer, but according to my information he predicted an annual unemployment rate of 9 per cent.

The Lord above did not give all the brains to members on the other side of the House. Many members of the House as well as people without the confines of this grand chamber have sufficient expertise and economic background to challenge the government and its bureaucrats. My leader referred to the unemployment figures, actual and adjusted, between the years 1960 and 1970. I should like to refer to another responsible paper, the *Financial Times*, which last month suggested that if this pattern of increasing unemployment, be it seasonally adjusted or actual, is not reversed, by February and March of 1971 there will be a rate of unemployment of 9 per cent to 10 per cent, or more than 750,000 Canadians out of work.

Reference was made to the rate of unemployment, adjusted and actual, in 1961. These figures led in 1962 to an actual rate of unemployment of 8.5 per cent in January, 9.1 per cent in February and 8.7 per cent in March. Therefore, unless the present pattern is reversed one can easily accept the statement that we might have 750,000

[Mr. Alexander.]

people out of work this winter or even as many as one million.

I see my time is running out. This has been a constructive debate. The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour said that the NDP had nothing to say. Perhaps I am wrong and it was another member who said that the NDP had nothing constructive to say. I ask hon. members to refer to the speech made by the hon. member for York South, wherein he placed before the government many constructive ideas. In addition, I emphasize the points that were made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

When one listens to members who come from slow-growth regions of Canada, one must remember that Canada is divided into five economic sectors. These divisions are the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia. These regions differ in terms of employment, rates of growth and composition of output. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), who is looking at me, would disagree with that. I should like to know why the government implements policies meant for the over-all good of the country but which nevertheless have disastrous effects on certain regions.

In closing, may I say that this motion is an important one. We must continually press the government to take responsibility for this situation, because the projected level of unemployment for February and March of next year is unacceptable. I return to my original premise, that we must concern ourselves not so much with the effects as with the causes of revolutionary movement. Revolutionaries prey upon the discontented. They prey upon those who are without proper housing, those who feel there is no room for them in our established, democratic way of life. It does not matter to me how many of these people there are; as long as our programs are not geared to assist those who are frustrated, in my view we are in for trouble.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair. The House will meet again at 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

---

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, the debate so far has ranged rather loosely over various forms of criticism directed at the government's monetary and fiscal policies. I think it can probably be reduced to simply a judgment of our timing or fine tuning, to use the words of Milton Friedman. Basically, it is reduced to a matter of judgment as to the wisdom of the timing or fine tuning of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) versus the allegedly more accurate and more refined tuning of those opposite.