

*The Budget—Mr. Pitman*

as they reflect on the bodily health and development of the whole nation. It does not matter very much, for example, that Australian swimmers won most of the gold medals. The point is that many thousands of Australian swimmers had opportunities to train and prepare themselves. It does not matter that the U.S.S.R. won all the gold medals in the gymnastic field. The point is that 70,000 Russian gymnasts had been trained in this program and provided the pool from which the final team could be drawn.

How can Canada take a successful part in athletics with the facilities we have? There is not one single regulation track in my constituency. There is only one regulation swimming pool in the whole of Ontario. I would suggest that sending people to the Olympics on this basis is an exercise in futility. Here is an area where something could be done. Other countries have done it, and we could do much to improve the health, welfare, education and culture of the Canadian people. By expanding the public authority we could create and strengthen the private sector and provide capital for investment which in turn would strengthen the private part of our economy.

I think we would do well to look to other countries, not because we in Canada have not the same ability to solve our problems but because, perhaps, we have not been obliged to take such action in the past. In Sweden government projects are all planned to be carried out in the off season. Special funds are allocated to be released as soon as unemployment figures reach a certain point. Government orders are stepped up at certain periods and tax laws are designed to encourage industry to build up investment funds rather than to overexpand, and release funds when a recession begins.

Here in Canada we have a problem involving the mobility of workers. Many men refuse to leave their own communities because they are liable to lose welfare benefits and, perhaps, because there is a possibility that when they reach the new areas the jobs will have disappeared. In Sweden the government undertakes to move workers to areas where jobs exist. The cost of such movement is paid and, if necessary, prefabricated houses are erected to accommodate the men and their families when they arrive.

In Norway there is provision for dynamic public works schemes. Long term loans for housing are available at the low interest rate of 3 per cent and control is exercised over unreasonable prices and profits. In Britain they stop industries from settling in congested areas of low unemployment and

induce them to settle in areas where unemployment is prevalent. I realize that the Minister of Finance has looked into this aspect of the question and promised double depreciation in respect to capital expenditure in the first year, applied to the first three years, in the case of industries settling in chronically depressed areas.

Three years ago Peterborough was named a model city in this nation. Especially it is regarded as a tourist paradise with its beautiful lakes and rivers and glorious countryside. But it was also noted for its economic health and growth. Today it is still a tourist paradise but, I am sorry to say, it may now perhaps be counted, in the terminology of the minister, as a depressed area. I find it very hard to speak of this constituency as a depressed area. I think it is deplorable that in a country with all the advantages we have there should be depressed areas. On the other hand I wonder just how it would be decided what are the depressed areas of this Canada of ours. Would it be based on unemployment figures such as four or five thousand unemployed in this city of 40,000 and its surrounding area? Would it be based on general welfare figures which are up by 400 per cent compared with the same month of last year? I hope some reasonable and fair method of determining what are to be called depressed areas may be adopted and that no cynical method based on political advantage will be introduced.

We have been thinking a great deal about this problem of unemployment in our constituency. It has been a matter of great concern, because the affairs of the country have, in a sense, been concentrated in Peterborough. As a result there has been a great deal of talk and writing. Those concerned with the industries of the community were asked exactly what is wrong, in their opinion, not with the Peterborough area alone but with the economy as a whole. As a result, the Peterborough *Examiner* ran a series of articles, and I should like in particular to quote one editorial which had this to say:

There is no political magic. A fundamental, radical, drastic reorganization of the economy is the prospect which, I think, faces us. There will be many to disagree. A plan for industrial expansion, tax reassessment, a drastic reduction of waste, a reduction in the cost, and undoubtedly the standard of living, a radical re-examination of political economy; these things are either needed or in the offing. If disarmament should come about they will be urgent.

These are some of the questions I will leave with both the minister and this government to think over. What would happen if suddenly disarmament were to come about. Are we going to approach the subject of disarmament with our tongues in our cheeks,