

To achieve this I will submit an expansionary budget this year—one which will help stimulate the economy and thereby open up new job opportunities for millions of Americans.

This is an approach which the government cannot understand.

It will be a full employment budget, a budget designed to be in balance if the economy were operating at its peak potential. By spending as if we were at full employment we would help to bring about full employment.

I reject the accusation that we on this side have done nothing but criticize, that we have failed to offer workable alternatives. Through our leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield), we were suggesting as long as a year ago that the government should immediately extend unemployment insurance benefits to bring temporary relief to Canadians out of jobs. We said there was immediate need to put more money into the hands of Canadian consumers, a course which would considerably stimulate the economy generally. As part of this suggestion, we advocated the removal of the 3 per cent surtax and proposed a selective reduction of personal and corporate income tax to get the economy moving again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the great Galilean carpenter once said that some have ears and cannot hear and some have eyes and cannot perceive. After listening to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler), I think those remarks are directly applicable to him. For him to say that the opposition has not put forward ideas for solving the unemployment problem shows that he has neither ears to hear with nor eyes to perceive with. Had he been listening, he would have heard all quarters of the opposition recommending tax changes, increased exemptions for single and married persons which would mean a tax saving for the people and rejuvenate the economy. If he had heard some of our members, more particularly our financial critic, he would have heard some of our ideas with regard to depreciation allowances and tax holidays. I am really surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre would make such a speech. It seems to me he should straighten out his thinking and also clean up his language in the speeches he does make.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The question of unemployment, and the tremendous impact it has had on municipalities across the country, is one of the most important matters that could be debated during the session. It is easy to say that there are 668,000 unemployed as of the month of January, that there are 100,000 on a retraining program, bringing the total up to roughly three-quarters of a million unemployed, but one has to be unemployed really to appreciate what it means.

It is those in the cities who are the hardest hit. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a company like Massey-Harris almost jokingly saying: "We are laying-off men because it does not fit within our profit picture to keep them on"; or: "It does not fit within the financial scheme the government has regarding valuing our dollar"? A few months ago 600 men in my own riding employed by

Alleged Non-Support of Employment Programs

Dunlop were "turfed out" practically overnight as a result of a change in policy by its foreign parent company. This is what unemployment means.

Why is it that Canada has the highest unemployment rate—6.6 per cent seasonally adjusted—and the lowest productive growth rate in the western world? Great Britain is worrying about an unemployment rate of 3.2 per cent, yet we have 6.6 per cent. There are probably many other reasons for this, but two reasons are, first, the constitutional attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and, second, the fiscal and monetary policies of the government.

If I may deal with the second reason first, the fiscal and monetary policies of the government, the Prime Minister and his cabinet deemed it wise, if we were to check inflation, to create unemployment. Did they not realize that they were making human sacrifices in order to solve financial problems? What a price to pay! People are put out of work while the government attempts to solve the problem of inflation. Not only does a worker lose his income, his dignity and his respect; his wife and children are placed in jeopardy and the whole family suffers psychological damage. These are some of the facts of unemployment.

I have been asked by young students why they should continue at school if there is no work available for them when they leave. I read in the newspaper that the University of Toronto has indicated that there has been a 30 per cent drop in the number of jobs for graduates and has recommended that they seek work in other countries, such as Germany, France, Sweden. So, we have arrived at this situation: no employment opportunities for our graduates, and the recommendation that they seek work in other countries. Is it any wonder that the youth of today are banding together and questioning the value of the system under which we live?

The first reason I gave was the constitutional hang-ups of the Prime Minister. His constitutional views are crucifying Canadians. Since he regards the municipalities as creatures of the province, he tells them: "Don't look to me, look to the province". Such an attitude is legalistic, cold, callous, indifferent and disgusting. Is the Prime Minister trying to balkanize the cities of this country? What has happened to his great election phrase "the just society"? What about national unity? Is the Prime Minister going to permit the constitution to deprive us of a united country? Is he going to deprive us of a just society by treating the main centres of Canada as though they do not exist, by treating them merely as creatures of the provinces instead of as a part, and an important part, of the general whole?

The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan), in introducing the motion, outlined the picture prevailing in Toronto, which is both dark and gloomy. The same could be said with regard to Montreal, or Victoria, B.C., or Winnipeg, or Peterborough—any of the large cities of this country. I would say that Mayor Dennison and his council should be given credit for bringing forward and into the open the question of unemployment in the cities. I also add that probably Mayor Dennison and his council should consider themselves very naïve if they think that Mem-