What is the situation? We have a crash program. I shall talk about that in a few minutes. I said a few moments ago that in September of this year 434,000 people were unemployed, or 7.1 per cent of the labour force at the seasonally adjusted rate. But September is a relatively good month, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Not for the Liberals.

Mr. Orlikow: In September, 1971, we had 10 per cent more unemployed than in September, 1970. I want the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, who said that we could not tolerate $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 6 per cent unemployment, to tell us what is going to happen.

Mr. Nesbitt: He doesn't know.

Mr. Orlikow: In February, 1971, we had 675,000 unemployed. Since we have 10 per cent more unemployed in September of 1971 than we had last September, I predict—after consultations with economists in government and outside who have been consistently more correct in their estimates than the economists to whom the Minister of Finance listens—that in February, 1972, the normal increase in employment which we have had will mean we will have 750,000 unemployed.

Mr. Whelan: No.

Mr. Orlikow: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), when estimating the effects of the Nixon economic policies announced a few weeks ago, estimated that if the U.S. surcharge remains in effect for a full year it will mean a loss of 90,000 jobs. I suggest, from a very simple calculation, that by next February the surcharge will result in another 50,000 unemployed. This means that between the normal unemployment and that caused by the Nixon economic policies we will have 800,000 unemployed.

Tonight the government announced programs which sound pretty good. The leader of our party and others have challenged the government, the Minister of Finance or any other member—the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour who is so ready to interject—to calculate the number of jobs that will be created by these programs.

Mr. Perrault: You estimate it.

Mr. Orlikow: The parliamentary secretary suggests that I make an estimate. I intend to do just that. I predict that the maximum number of jobs produced by these programs—and it will not be in the next four months because there is a considerable time lag between the announcement of a program and its implementation—will be in the neighbourhood of 50,000. Mr. Speaker, that means that in February, 1972, this country will be faced with 750,000 people unemployed. I hope I am wrong. I would love to hear some parliamentary secretary say I am wrong. Although I have been here for close to ten years, I have not discovered what functions parliamentary secretaries serve. However, in the light of estimates prepared by economists attached to the Department of Finance, prepared by economists attached to the Department of Manpower and prepared by economists attached to Statistics Canada, I should be happy to hear the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Perrault) get up and tell me I am wrong, that I have exaggerated and that there will only be 500,000 or 400,000 people unemployed this coming winter. They will not do that, because they know the figures I have given are pretty close to being correct.

• (11:00 p.m.)

I am not alone in my concern. To show that what I am saying is not particularly partisan, may I quote from a short article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on October 9, headed, "Welfare roll boost expected this winter with job scarcity". The estimates I am about to quote have not been made by politicians, have not been made by economists or by elected people; they have been made by people who have the responsibility of seeing that Canadians do not suffer too much and do not go hungry. Of course, I am talking about the welfare directors of a series of cities in the most prosperous province of this country, Ontario. Here, in part, is how the article reads:

In Oshawa, where rolls doubled last year, welfare administrator H. G. Chesebrough said last month's announcement by General Motors to lay off workers could swell the welfare rolls. —

In London the January, 1971, welfare rolls were 33 per cent higher than the January, 1970 rolls—

The administrator there expects the welfare budget to be 15 per cent higher than it was in 1970. I continue quoting:

In Peterborough, officials predict welfare costs this winter will rise by 25 per cent over last winter. —

In North Bay, Nipissing District welfare administrator Royal Poulin said he predicts the number of people on welfare will rise by 40 per cent. —

In August, 1970,—

This will interest the hon. member for Windsor.

—Windsor's expenditures totalled $197,676. In August, 1971, the figure rose to $310,285.

These are facts. They cannot be ignored or pushed aside by the government, and they will not be met by the hastily conceived and, in many cases, ill conceived proposals brought forward by the Minister of Finance this evening as a result of the government's fright.

What do we have here? We have $113 million in further loans for housing, sewage and land assembly. Any province or city which has had dealings with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation knows that a minimum of one year elapses between the time a proposal is made and when it is approved and work can begin. That $113 million will join the line-up for approval behind the tens of millions of dollars worth of projects that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is considering. Much of that money will not be used in the winter of 1971-72.

Then, we have $35 million for job training. I do not have time to go into details but, as has already been pointed out, we have already upgraded through job training in our Manpower training centres over one million Canadians. As my leader said, this winter we will have the most highly trained unemployed people in the world.

What does the government propose as its major method of dealing with the unemployment crisis? It proposes just what one would expect from a millionaire Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and a big business administration, a 7 per