

*Economic Policies and Unemployment*

economy and regions of the nation. The result has been a continuing upward spiral in costs accompanied by drastic and unacceptable increases in the levels of unemployment.

But this has not been the only failure of the government's anti-inflation policy. Any responsible government, in attempting to deal with inflation, not only attempts to reduce the upward pressures on costs, it also attempts to reduce the hardships imposed upon those who are suffering as a result of its inability to regulate the economy properly. For our pensioners, for our low income earners, for all on fixed incomes, for those handicapped with physical, social, economic or other disadvantage today, today's sickness is one of too little and not too much.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Rowland:** We cannot, as responsible Canadians, tell our fellow citizens in these circumstances, wait and pull in your belt for awhile. Yet, that is what this government is doing.

Canadian farmers are in deep trouble and need cash now. Low income families have no more slack to pull in. They need real assurance, not just that the cost of living will not rise as fast, but that their capacity to meet the cost of living will be substantially improved. The family in poor housing with no capacity to pay high rent or high mortgage interest has a need which can only be met by building adequate low cost housing. The emerging student, and the worker seeking to improve his skills, must not be left to swell the ranks of the unemployed, or to remain among the too great numbers of underemployed. These Canadians require more than relief payments, unemployment insurance benefits, or even more training. They require new jobs and better jobs to be created by development of the economy.

But the federal government refuses to meet these needs, refuses to deal with these effects of inflation. This is but one more piece of evidence of the bankruptcy of the federal government's anti-inflationary policy. It is but one more reason why the New Democratic Party will support the essential message contained in the motion now before this House.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I might indicate that I have recently been acquainted with the subject of a conversation between two members of our caucus upon learning that I was making my maiden effort in here today. One of them indicated that he hoped it would not be too maidenly and the other said

[Mr. Rowland.]

that if the examples of maidens we have seen recently are any indication, perhaps that would be a good thing. I hope I have lived up to his expectations.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** On behalf of all my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in the debate on the motion moved by the member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade); given the current economic situation in Canada, the motion is very important but it does not make any concrete suggestion. In fact, it censures the government and urges it—

to take immediate steps to change its economic policies which are contributing to the growing rate of unemployment as evidenced by the figures just released by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Rightly, the member for Sainte-Marie has strongly criticized the present government. Unfortunately, he has failed to make concrete suggestions likely to improve economic conditions in Canada.

It is a fact that there are 545,000 unemployed in Canada, that 611,000 students will be looking for jobs this summer, which represents a total of 1,156,000 jobless. It is also true that the economic upsurge should be the first concern of the government. However, the hon. member was careful not to bring forward practical suggestions.

Besides, we had a Conservative government in power in 1960-61, when the total number of unemployed in Canada reached the alarming figure of one million, and no economic improvement was introduced in 1962 or in 1963. That was one of the reasons why the administration of the right hon. John G. Diefenbaker collapsed in February 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should, of course, blame the government for its mistakes. However, I also believe that we should propose some reforms.

Yesterday, everybody felt sorry for the 545,000 unemployed. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) stated that 1970 will be an extremely difficult