

Employment Programs

employed for input of dollars, put your money into housing because it has a marvellous economic spinoff effect on the whole economy.

The government has said that it wants to do something about employment and that it is really concerned. Why does it not get involved in serious deficit financing? Why does it not commit itself to spending millions of dollars in the next decade to co-ordinate house building programs in Canada which would create employment? This would simultaneously achieve two important social objectives. It would provide a needed social entity, housing, and an equally important social benefit, employment for men and women who want to work.

Specifically, I would like to emphasize certain areas in the housing program. First, we need a major increase of funds going into public housing. Public housing is needed and will continue to be needed in the foreseeable future by pensioners, single parents and unorganized workers who cannot, under any circumstances, afford to purchase homes. Second, we have to make housing available to average workers at low interest rates, both of the single dwelling and condominium types, at interest rates that do not exceed 3½ per cent. This is what the government of Nova Scotia, a Liberal government, has recently done. They acted upon what we have advocated for a number of years. They decided to subsidize interest rates and have discriminated in favour of average and poor people. They have guaranteed homes for the average people in Nova Scotia, and are doing this by providing all the capital or cash needed above the 3½ per cent interest to pay for single dwelling units for working people.

There is also a marvellous prospect for the imaginative use of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation funds in the housing field. I see no reason why we cannot indulge in a little variation of how we rebuild the cores of our major cities. Some time ago a very imaginative proposal was presented to interested people in the city of Hamilton. It was suggested that in urban renewal projects, instead of demolishing the centre of the city, rooting the poor people from their homes and communities and shifting them to the suburbs, the government make a colossal loan, in comparative terms, for a complete city block. If CMHC provided money to a new co-operative enterprise which would involve all the people who live in that block, home owners as well as shopkeepers, these people would be allowed to retain their present dwellings in many cases. Through this loan, dwellings could either be rehabilitated or new ones built. The local store could be maintained. This would be accomplished through one loan, not a gift, from CMHC. With this kind of approach, we would provide homes, accommodation and maintain a sense of community in our large cities. This would be an imaginative use of public funds.

These are a few examples of where and how the money should be spent. I remind the government that there is one province that has decided to move with public funds, deal with unemployment and housing. I refer to the province of Manitoba. At least the cabinet ministers know that. This year the government of Manitoba will spend \$770 million on housing, up 18 per

[Mr. Broadbent.]

cent over last year. In public housing alone, it will spend \$33 million, up 154 per cent over last year and, incidentally, up almost 1,000 per cent over 1969 when that government replaced a Conservative government in that province.

Apart from providing homes to the people of Manitoba who need them, the major economic consequence which affects that whole province is that it now has the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada. Unemployment has been increasing in every other province. In the province of Manitoba, it has been decreasing. Manitoba now has a 4.8 per cent level of unemployment, the lowest in this country. There are many reasons for this, but the main reason is that it has a government that is committed to using public money for public purposes, particularly at times of high unemployment. I see no reason why this government cannot take a few lessons from one of the provincial governments.

The last specific suggestion I want to make is with regard to the manpower retraining program. I am pleased to see the minister in charge of retraining in the chamber. There is a lot of talk about students and junior executives who are unable to find jobs. I am concerned about them, but I remind hon. members that most people in this country are not students or junior executives. They are ordinary people such as farmers, steel workers and fishermen whose educational level is not that high. They constitute the vast majority of people in this country. Our emphasis should be directed primarily toward that group and, with respect, not toward the minority who happen to be university students.

What happens in terms of our manpower retraining program? I am sure that all hon. members, including myself, have been involved in this in recent weeks, particularly because of the level of unemployment. I have been involved in discussions in my constituency about the effects of the manpower retraining program. I have discovered, and this has been corroborated in conversation with many other members, that the kind of effective co-ordination of planning required between the federal and provincial governments to have an effective manpower retraining program simply does not exist.

About one year ago I brought to the attention of the House and a committee of this House a critique of the existing manpower retraining programs from the point of view that no effective planning in terms of training people for jobs that are going to be available actually existed in this country. The critique came from the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario, a group made up of teachers and administrators which is certainly not allied politically with any group. They said and I quote:

● (3:50 p.m.)

The Canada manpower centre and the local educational facility operate, as had been said, in administrative vacuums, with little or no constructive consultation at either the policy formulation level or in the day-to-day administrative routine. Apparently the federal department feels its prerogatives are better protected with things this way, making the erroneous assump-