

*The Budget—Mr. Perrault*

described the unemployment rate as appalling and staggering. It is unsatisfactory, without doubt—we all feel that way.

I ask that leader whether in his view it is really responsible to use figures which have not been adjusted seasonally to overstate his position. He said there is an unemployment rate of 6½ per cent. The seasonally corrected rate is just over 4 per cent. Both figures are infinitely lower than the figure in his own province of Saskatchewan when he left that province in tatters in 1961. During the period of CCF government in Saskatchewan there was a mass exodus from that province, so much so that Saskatchewan lost seats after the last redistribution. If the CCF was able to evolve a precise and definitive answer to the problem of unemployment during its tenure of office, why did the people leave, why the drop in population? There were no entry restrictions and passports were not required; indeed, people were invited to come into the province.

In 1961, with the problem of unemployment, a serious factor in Saskatchewan, the national leader of the NDP in this House, then the Premier of Saskatchewan—I have a copy of his speech—could not bring himself to refer directly to the problem of unemployment in his province. There was not one word about the loss of jobs and opportunities, and not one word about the heartbreak to which he referred this afternoon; the heartbreak, he said, of the unemployed about which he spoke so passionately that some of us were actually moved when listening to him. The organization which officially supported the CCF in Saskatchewan had unkind words to say about this Premier, now the national leader of the NDP. This is what they said in 1961:

So far the government of Saskatchewan has neither obtained the action from the federal government needed to increase unemployment let alone to create full employment, nor has it in the alternative requested the necessary legal authority with a view to creating badly needed jobs.

Their official report went on to say that Saskatchewan needed 10,000 new jobs annually to take care of the increasing labour force; however, only 4,000 new jobs were being provided. The result of not meeting this need for new jobs was migration out of the province at a rate of about 8,000 per year and additions to the number of unemployed. This must go down as one of the most scathing indictments ever levelled by a federation of labour. This was the report of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to the cabinet in

1961. It must be one of the worst indictments ever levelled by a labour organization in Canada.

Tonight we have been told that the NDP, the Socialist party, is heartbroken about unemployment. We need only review the record to find out exactly the extent of their compassion when they were given an opportunity to do something about it. Time and again we are reminded by this Socialist party that the Socialist party in Britain is the great, spiritual home of the NDP in this country. Do they want the Labour solution used in Britain? They have been coy during this entire debate about what they would do to fight inflation. Are they suggesting that we adopt the Labour, Socialist wage controls used in Britain? Do they believe the restrictions which that government attempted to place on the trade unions represented a proper move? Are they suggesting the kind of restrictions introduced by Barbara Castle? Is that the NDP solution? We want to know explicitly what their program is and how much it is going to cost.

I have before me a transcript of an NDP convention at which one of the NDP delegates stood up and said, "It is all right for our party to make all these promises, but how do we pay for them?" Do you know what happened to him? He was hooted down. Even in the report it says he was hooted down. One of the marks of a party which is able to govern is its sense of responsibility. That was not demonstrated this afternoon by the party to my far left. No one likes or wants unemployment. In the context of a free society the government of Canada is determined to meet and beat the problem of inflation instead of inviting an infinitely worse situation later for a longer period of time.

Today's policy challenges a free society to accept the responsibilities of freedom. It is a policy which asks for co-operation and restraint; a policy which says to management, "Restrict your profits," a policy which says to consumer, "Buy prudently and well," a policy which says to government, "Design your spending programs for the real needs of the people," a policy which says to the organized labour movement, "Do not set your wage goals beyond productivity, because if you do the fires of inflation will be fed and indeed your gains will be illusory." How is the doctrine of restraint really being preached by the leaders of the two major opposition parties in this House? Have they gone for the short yardage of immediate political advantage?