

The Budget—Mr. Allmand

industry, business and local governments in an attempt to reduce the work week by 10 per cent and increase the work force by 10 per cent. In other words, the work now available should be spread around in order to encompass more people. This would mean a 36-hour work week instead of a 40-hour work week, or a seven-hour day for five days a week instead of an eight-hour day. If such a program were adopted, one additional man could be employed for every seven men now working.

There have been objections to such a suggestion. Some people say it would be inefficient. I do not understand that. Inefficient for whom? I do not think it is more efficient to have eight men working seven hours a day rather than seven men working eight hours a day. It has been suggested that this would decrease the weekly pay packet by five hours a week. That is true. However, if the work force was increased by 10 per cent, taxes could be reduced because social and welfare payments, manpower training payments and other payments could be decreased. This would result in approximately the same take-home pay as at present. It has been suggested that the problem of unemployment could be solved by economic growth. We are achieving economic growth today without employment growth. Our economic growth is due to technology, not labour-intensive industry.

An hon. Member: It is also due to the Liberals.

Mr. Allmand: There is also a trend from productive industries to service industries as well as service industries on a higher level. Those who say we should provide jobs tend to think that productive capacity can be expanded indefinitely in the work force. According to what I have read, this is not the case. This type of program could be carried out by negotiation or by government incentives. I wish to suggest another solution. This might also appear to be very simple, and there may be arguments against it. I offer it to this forum for discussion.

Mr. Woolliams: We will not have time to discuss it.

Mr. Allmand: Preference for new jobs should only be offered to the chief breadwinner of a family unless he is earning less than \$6,000 a year. I know of many cases in my own city, as well as here in Ottawa, where the head of the family is earning in excess of \$10,000 a year and his wife is earning \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year. Something should be done about changing jobs which are either man-oriented or woman-oriented. Many secretarial and other types of jobs in the House of Commons, some of which pay fairly well, are held by women. Many other jobs are held exclusively by men. The system should be more flexible. Many of these jobs could be held by people who support a family, rather than by people who are supplementing a family income. These two proposals are minor to my first proposal that a special committee be established to study in depth the problem of unemployment.

Many members suggested a tax cut. I think that should be considered further. However, at this point I am not convinced that it would solve the problem. If personal and corporate taxes were cut, would that money be used

[Mr. Allmand.]

to create new jobs? I am not convinced that it would. It may help the rich much more than it would help the poor. People with low incomes pay a low rate of tax; I doubt whether a cut in taxes would stimulate the economy sufficiently to create jobs for them. I understand that a few years ago in the United States taxes were cut and that money did work its way into the economic system quickly and it did create jobs. However, I am not sure whether in this case it would do so.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I wish to close my contribution to this debate by expressing the hope that what we have been saying in the last two days will result in action helpful to the unemployed. When I listen to these debates I often wonder whether they are of any value; I have the impression they are used by members on all sides of the House just to score political points. I would hope we could all make a contribution to the solution of this problem which is beyond politics.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, during the last two days we have heard in this debate analysis after analysis, but when all is said and done we are left with the cold fact that there is mounting unemployment. There are today in Canada about 600,000 people unemployed, and the number is steadily increasing. We ask ourselves: When will the end come? There are many more who are not even on the list. Many of them are young people who have never been on the labour market before. They receive no benefits and they may not even be eligible for manpower training because they have not been in the labour force for three years.

This is not a negligible factor. Nearly 50 per cent of the unemployed are 25 years old or younger. Nearly 20 per cent are less than 20 years of age. They are to be found across Canada, mostly in the cities. Some of them hold university degrees. Some are bitter and disillusioned. They were told that if they were well trained and educated the world would be at their feet. They have heard the story of the just society. If some of them are now bitter and disillusioned, can you blame them, Mr. Speaker? They are young, they are willing, and there is no work for them.

Many of them are single and are not eligible, in a number of places, for welfare. Many are going around begging. In all the time I have practiced medicine I have never had so many people coming to me for help, and a great many of them are young people, some with university degrees. The interesting thing is this: the only way you can aid these people who are not eligible is by giving it yourself or by getting it from somebody else, for example, from the Salvation Army. The government does not cover these young people who have not been in the labour market. They put me in mind of the doctor who had a sick patient. He said, "I can cure this patient's disease; there is no question about that. I can give him the right medicine. All that bothers me is whether the patient will survive long enough to benefit from it." In this young group the seeds of dissent and revolution can easily be planted. The present situation is worse than it