

Mr. Otto: Yes, but the only other one I have a record of is this \$1,700,000 project, most of which will be spent on equipment. It will put only 111 people to work.

There are other ways in which cities could do a great deal. They could overlook the restrictions they have imposed on employment. I am speaking of the requirements they have imposed whereby for the past four or five years a job must be done by a licensed repairman or a licensed fence mender. All these groups have managed to get themselves into a nice little corner. Only one person can build a fence around a house; only one group of people can put up an addition to a house; only one person can paint. That person has to be a member of the Metropolitan Home Repair Association and he must have a licence. There are many people who could undertake jobs now if the cities would only relax some of these restrictions.

Most important of all, Mr. Speaker, a municipality can be very influential in exuding confidence throughout industry. Let us say we are talking about winter works projects. The city of Toronto knows it is going to put in the Gardiner extension, as well as other highways. It could immediately ask for tenders for the material only. Inside two or three days it could get the tender prices and then say to the manufacturers of the pipes, the conduits, the manhole covers and the light standards, "You have yourself a job; start building up inventory." The only person who is going to solve this immediate problem of unemployment is the manufacturer. He is the one who must be given confidence to build up inventory. As soon as he is confident that he will sell his inventory he will rehire 15 or 20 people, or he will not lay-off the workers he planned to lay-off. The manufacturers are the ones who can solve the immediate problem, and it is the municipalities which can contact the manufacturers. This is the type of thing I would have liked to have seen recommended in this motion.

If we spend the rest of the day hashing over what has happened, crucifying the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), making him beat his chest and say "I am sorry", we will achieve nothing. We want ideas on how to get people back to work, and on how the municipalities can assist.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, there is no better description of the lack of regard for the disadvantaged citizens of our nation than the wording of this motion. I should like to quote that part:

—the government's failure to foresee and take steps to provide for the escalating effects of its unemployment policy upon the social assistance funds of the provinces and municipalities and its failure to consult and co-operate with the provinces and municipalities in providing emergency financial support and employment programs.

The tragedy is that the people affected are those who cannot do anything about it, the poor. There are over 4 million of our citizens, out of a population of 21½ million, who continue to suffer more and more each day because the government, which is supposed to be concerned, took a deliberate line of attack against inflation in order to

Alleged Non-Support of Employment Programs

achieve an objective which it thinks is in the best interests of the country. It is awfully difficult for me to understand how any group of individuals, whether they be government or any other interested group of Canadians can, by design, treat individuals in such a cold-blooded fashion. The state must provide the opportunity for these human beings to earn a decent livelihood, not only because it is the duty of the state but because it is the responsibility of an elected body to govern to the best advantage of all citizens.

I have tried, during the short time I have been here as a Member of Parliament, to be reasonable in recognizing the difficulties which any government must encounter in facing the problems of a growing nation. But sooner or later, one must also recognize that even though all decisions cannot satisfy the majority, and at times must be unpopular to many, those in power have a duty to every citizen, not only to those who can provide for themselves but also to those who cannot. Let us forget politics for a few moments. Let us just consider the facts, even without going into the DBS figures which seem to be the basis of debate in the House of Commons.

This great Canadian nation, with natural resources which are the envy of the world, with wealth in minerals, in oil, in our forests and in our seas, elected a government charged with the responsibility of governing 21½ million people. Our population is not even big enough to take advantage of our wealth in resources, and yet this government, which has had the help of the greatest experts in science and technology, allows almost a quarter of our population to remain living below the poverty line. This government of ours governs by words. It governs by Speeches from the Throne. It governs by promises of things to come, and it has grandiose proclamations.

Members of the government have said, and I quote:

We must ensure that every Canadian regardless of where he lives must have equality of opportunity... It is our duty to look after the poor and the disadvantaged... We will never succeed in our aims unless everyone—even those at the grass roots level become involved and participate in government—

What has happened since 1968? The cost of living keeps increasing; more people become unemployed; the weak get weaker, and with the policies of the government even the strong deteriorate in strength.

If I can mention my short experience here in this House and go back to 1968, it is not too difficult to recall the promises that were made by the government to help the disadvantaged. But here we are in 1971, and all the government has done has been to appoint study committees and royal commissions to find out what is wrong in Canada. In 1968 the Economic Council published a mountainous report on poverty in Canada and came up with the startling conclusion that poverty was real. What has happened since then? After three years, the government has come up with a white paper on social security. The other day one professor said it was a white paper on the insecurity of income security. Now, with a big kind heart, the government has agreed to increase old age pensions by 42 cents. It is true the guaranteed income supplement