

These social welfare statistics represent abstract points and very often hide the human suffering and bitterness which results from cold and hard figures. For a moment let us look, instead, at the human interests of the people in my riding. Let me read from a letter I received from one of my constituents. It reads in part:

After the tugboat strike I am blacklisted and am unable to get a job. What with the strike and unemployment I have no unemployment benefits left. I had to get a job at \$1.65 per hour or go on welfare. That I don't want. But, however, I can quite see why people go on the welfare and stay there. It would not pay them to take a job at \$1.65 an hour and pay into the pension fund and unemployment stamps. They make more in a month than I do working, plus they get free hospital, dentist, doctor, etc., etc. I can quite see their point of view, why work? They could not afford to live on \$1.65 per hour and keep a family, so going on welfare they receive more. It seems that there are many thousands of people only making \$1.65 per hour, mostly workers who don't belong to a trade union.

He goes on to say how difficult it is for him to manage after being a highly paid and, presumably, highly skilled industrial worker. He concludes by saying:

I am only writing this so that you can see, from a working man's point of view, the way things are under this Liberal government. This tough year of unemployment might teach the working man which way to vote the next time.

I am sure this man has a great deal of faith. I hope it will not be necessary for the workingman to take the punitive political action suggested by this constituent. I hope the government will read the signs and see the way things are. Let us consider suggestions which have been made in respect of this difficult problem of continuing and increasing unemployment. As a result of a study by the Vancouver United Community Services, a booklet was issued under the title "Guaranteed income or guaranteed employment?" On the first page of the summary and conclusions it is stated:

A more basic reason for the support of the guaranteed income concept by all political parties is our changing technology and changing labour needs. Private industry no longer needs the pool of low-skilled labour which once provided an important cushion for the ups and downs of the labour market.

The booklet goes on to say other things. For instance, at page iii it states:

If benefits for the unemployed are set at adequate levels, what of the 'work incentive'? Will the result be to create a nation of loafers? And with increasing automation, should we stress the need for work—or train for leisure?

But they answer their own question in paragraph 1 by observing:

Several factors suggest that "man cannot live by bread alone", that opportunity for constructive work should be our primary goal.

People want and need to work. They develop their identity, their meaning in life, through working in an occupation. Contrary to popular belief, mounting evidence shows that when job opportunities with adequate incomes are available, even the "hard-core unemployed" choose to work rather than loaf.

These UCS people have some other very interesting things to say, but I see that I am not getting through to

#### *Alleged Non-Support of Employment Programs*

many members by quoting from these scholarly sources so I will return to my notes. Time is limited.

What is needed instead of a piecemeal approach is a comprehensive social security policy. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) is well aware of the different, competing and overlapping plans which now exist, including old age security, family allowances, unemployment insurance and others. We can no longer accept such a patchwork type of system to meet the needs of the people in our society. We need, instead, some kind of comprehensive social security package in the form of a guaranteed income plan. If we cannot supply guaranteed employment we will have to move toward an income maintenance program.

In spite of all the mutterings to the contrary, in the municipalities I represent there are few malingers on welfare. Some politicians get a great deal of mileage out of the myth or the misconception that much of our welfare tax dollar is going to this type of person. They get a lot of mileage out of the suggestion that welfare payments go to people who basically are lazy bums. This is not the situation in my area, although there may be some there. I think it might be worth while to examine the situation and find out what type of person is on welfare.

First of all there are the aged. A person who is by one day under 65 can receive \$95 per month from social welfare. If that person were 65 he might receive \$130 or \$135 per month. In this example alone we can see that there is a cruel anomaly. Let us consider the abandoned wife with children. She is tied up in the home. Very often she worked before she was married but, having been deserted or abandoned, she is stuck with the children and cannot get out to work. Therefore, few have any alternative but to abandon the children or go on social welfare, and in most cases they choose the latter.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Further, there are the physically disabled people who are unable to work because of physical disability or illness. There are the people with psychological problems. They may be alcoholics, people who fight with their bosses or cannot get along with their wives and as a result cannot go to work the next day. Unless they receive much counselling they will probably never be able to hold steady jobs.

There are the dropouts who do not have the education or skill to compete for employment in this highly technological age. Our society demands a higher and higher level of skill all the time. In spite of this we have another group of unemployed who require an increasing proportion of our welfare funds: these people are overeducated for the development of our country.

What kind of solution can we propose to assist in solving these problems in our society? Certainly day-care centres would be very useful for wives with some saleable skill who would like to go out to work. I think that for a number of the psychologically and physically handicapped we will have to look for these kinds of things that we have for people who have mental deficiencies,