

the few proposals we got from the Minister of Finance really offered no hope to the Canadian people.

The same can be said for the speech by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Clark). He said we need to produce a feeling of confidence for the Canadian people. I say to him, as I said a few moments ago to the Minister of Finance, how can you get Canadians to have confidence in our economy, how can you get them to invest in productivity improvements in Canadian plants and industry, when they can see that those plants are now working so far below capacity? Why should people invest in new plants and equipment when industry cannot sell the goods it now produces with existing plants and equipment. Why should they invest in Canadian industry when they can put their money into government bonds or term deposits and make substantially more than they would by putting it into even the best of the blue-chip companies?

• (2110)

Then the Leader of the Opposition said that we need to have government restraint. He was very careful not to indicate where a Conservative government would cut back. In other words, where the restraint would come from. Some Conservative Members of Parliament have not been as careful as the Leader of the Opposition was today. Some Conservative members since November, 1980, have not infrequently expressed admiration for the kinds of policies which are being enacted in the United States under the leadership of President Reagan. Let us look at those policies for which, I think, some Conservatives have a great deal of admiration. Let us just take a look at what President Reagan has done to get restraint in the American economy. He has cut back on medicare and medicaid. He has cut back very drastically on the food stamp program, which is the closest thing the Americans have to our family allowance system. He has cut back on financial assistance to American states and cities. He has cut funding to American universities. He has cut back support for research and development and he has urged cutbacks in the American social security benefits.

If that is the kind of restraint that Conservative Members of Parliament believe in, they ought to be honest with the Canadian people.

**Mr. Gamble:** You should, too.

**Mr. Orlikow:** I think the Conservatives ought to tell Canadians that that is how they would cut back on government expenditures. If they did that, I am certain the Canadian people would not want to support parties which advocate those kinds of programs.

**Mr. Gamble:** What about the giveaways?

**Mr. Orlikow:** I wish the hon. member would rise in his seat in his own time and tell us which are the giveaway programs. Is medicare a giveaway program?

**Mr. Gamble:** What about foreign aid?

**Mr. Orlikow:** Is social security a giveaway program?

**An hon. Member:** What about the CBC?

### *Supply*

**Mr. Orlikow:** Is hospital insurance a giveaway program? Those are the kinds of giveaway programs that I want to continue and expand. If hon. members want to cut back on those, they ought to tell us.

Unemployment has reached a crisis situation. Unemployment is at a 40-year high. Some economists, either tenured economists in our Canadian universities or economists with good paying, secure jobs in the Department of Finance or even economists with the Economic Council, are telling us that we should not worry about unemployment, that the situation is not very serious. We are told that we are into the post-industrial age, and we have to accept the fact that our manufacturing industries will gradually disappear. I wish some of those so-called experts would talk to some of my constituents.

One of my constituents whom I met last week came to this country from Portugal in 1959. He came to Canada because he had been told and had read that this was a great country. He came here prepared to work, and he did work for 13 years for the Swift Canadian packing plant in Winnipeg. Swift is a multinational company. It is one of the giants in the food industry. After working there for 13 years, Swift Canadian closed its plant in Winnipeg and put 600 people out of work. This constituent of mine got a job with another Canadian giant. This time his job was with the CPR as a machinist's helper. He was doing a good job, but after two and a half years, because of a slowdown in the economy, he was laid off. I wish those so-called experts who think unemployment is not very serious would talk to my constituents and to thousands of others who, through no fault of their own, are no longer working.

As the Minister of Finance said this afternoon, we have 1.25 million people unemployed. But those are official figures. The minister and other members of the House know that those figures include only those people unemployed who are still actively looking for work. There are areas in Canada; in Newfoundland, in Cape Breton, in the Gaspé and in the Interlake area in Manitoba—where it is no use looking for work. People are not looking for work in those areas any more and they are not counted in the unemployment figures. We have probably another 300,000 or 400,000 unemployed, if they were included in the statistics.

Bankruptcies have increased by almost 40 per cent. We now have 800 to 900 businesses that go bankrupt every month. Probably for every one that goes bankrupt there are four or five businesses that close up voluntarily before having to declare bankruptcy. It is no longer only the unskilled people in the slow growth areas who are unemployed. Today, we find it is no longer only the small, inefficient companies that are going bankrupt. Today we find that vacancies for accountants, executives, engineers, scientists and other professionals have decreased by 47 per cent in the last year. University graduates are finding it more and more difficult to get jobs. Statistics Canada tells us that 32,000 managers and administrators are unemployed. I am sure that every Member of Parliament knows some person in his or her constituency who has a middle