

nomly; and for the man over 40 who is jobless, not because he is untrained, but because in our youth-oriented society he is considered too old.

The minister went on to say:

In the 70s, it is fully expected that temporary unemployment will be a possibility for a broader spectrum of the Canadian work force than ever before.

Some of the figures which have been placed before us today reflect the minister's views—these figures, which disturb members of all parties, reflect the widespread technological displacement of labour in this country. This is precisely one of the reasons we need the wide-ranging reforms in unemployment insurance which were brought into the House by the Minister of Labour—the minister who has been criticized unfairly, in my view, this afternoon. It is to be hoped all members of the House realize that no new program of the magnitude of the new unemployment insurance program can be put into effect without a great deal of thought and planning, and that it would be wrong to set aside the far-reaching and comprehensive plan now under review in favour of stopgap, short-term modifications. Surely the present arrangements require something more than patchwork. They must be replaced by an over-all plan which will provide new and meaningful benefits for the work force.

The plan which is now before the House and, specifically, before the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, is the product of two years of hard work and planning by the government. Yes, and now with the co-operation of government and opposition members. Of those two years, close to six months was required to review and approve the proposal in all its aspects, to write the white paper, print it and distribute it. The government in no way apologizes for the time required to achieve an adequate public understanding of the white paper and to enable Canadians to express their views. Additional time has been required for this review by the public and by the House committee. Certainly, the work of the Standing Committee under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Weatherhead) deserves commendation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) who sits with me on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presently dealing with unemployment insurance, has missed the purport of the motion before the House. The first part of the preamble to that motion reads:

Whereas there has been a relentless upward climb in the level of unemployment in all regions of Canada—

I do not think the hon. member will disagree with that. The motion continues:

Whereas a number of responsible economic authorities have predicted record levels of unemployment this coming winter—

Employment Programs

I believe the hon. member will agree with that, too. Then there is a third paragraph, one which is of some concern to me, I should like to discuss it as it applies to the province of Quebec, the city of Hamilton and, indeed, to all regions. One thing which puzzles me is that a country which is so rich in resources, so rich in technical know-how, so industrially advanced and served by so many employable people who wish to work, should find itself in a position calling for a motion such as we have before us today.

I am not saying the government has intentionally and heartlessly followed a program designed to bring about the present state of affairs, but I do say the government is proving itself complacent and apathetic in the face of it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) told us that he had been concerned ever since the sixties by the trend which showed there was an acceleration of inflation to an extent which threatened not only Canadian economic development but Canadian unity itself. It seems to me that rising unemployment also threatens not only the stability of our economy but the stability of the whole nation. A balance must be maintained. At present the scale seems to be tipping away from the government in this regard.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) takes an attitude which can only be called complacent and apathetic. The Premier of Ontario says rising unemployment has been deliberately brought about by policies adopted in Ottawa. The answer given by the Prime Minister some time ago spoke of unemployment as being a regrettable side effect of government fiscal and monetary policy. Surely we must take note of the disastrous side effects of this policy on those unable to combat it successfully. I think it is time the government reassessed the regrettable side effects of its fiscal and monetary policies.

An editorial which appeared on Wednesday in the *Toronto Telegram* of October 11 stated:

In Quebec we are seeing how social unrest caused in part by chronically high unemployment has been a root cause of political extremism. If regional unemployment goes unsolved elsewhere no one can be sure violence will not be tried again in other parts of Canada.

It appears to me that the government is ignoring the frustration of the old, the anger of the young, the hopelessness of the poverty-stricken and the frustrated incentive of employables. It seems to me that the prospects of revolution will be determined to some extent by the social and economic status achieved by the groups I have just mentioned. It seems to me that we have been dealing with the effects. We must not let the War Measures Act and the temporary emergency powers bill cloud our vision and turn us away from a study of the causes. One has only to look back over the past couple of weeks to a policy adopted by politicians in the country to the south of us who tried to emphasize the need for law and order, a policy that was not accepted by the vast majority of Americans. They were more concerned, as I have often said, with the nuts and bolts, nitty-gritty issues, one of which of prime importance is unemployment.