

*The Budget—Mr. Rondeau*

summer, they take a sample of the unemployed in the cities.

Mr. Speaker, let us establish statistics now with statistics. For instance, the 800 persons taking the monthly census each represent about 6,500 households, because there were 5,180,473 households in Canada in 1966.

How is it that the province of Newfoundland has 71 census takers while it has only about 96,632 households? Therefore, there are about five times too many investigators in Newfoundland since they should be 14 and not 71. Are those statistics serious? With such random statistics it is no wonder that the government is all the time probing and searching. The governments are very well represented by such bad statistics. Our statistics are a joke when we know the way they are made up. Only jokers can make such statistics.

Since Prince Edward Island comprises 25,360 households, it should have four investigators instead of nine, so there are five too many.

Nova Scotia, with 185,245 households, should be entitled to about 29 investigators. It has 54, 25 too many.

New Brunswick has 141,761 households and is entitled to 21 investigators. There are 43—22 too many or twice as many as it should have.

The province of Quebec with 1,389,115 households would qualify for 214 investigators, but since it has only 153 it is short 60.

Ontario has 1,876,545 households, should have 289 investigators, has only 201, therefore it is short 87 if ratios should be taken into account to get accurate figures.

Manitoba has 259,280 households and would be entitled to 40 investigators but has 47, that is 7 too many.

In Saskatchewan there are 260,822 households and it should be entitled to 40 investigators; there are 51 of them, so 11 too many.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Alberta includes 393,707 households, so it would be entitled to 60 investigators; however, it has 81 investigators—21 too many.

British Columbia had 543,075 households in 1966 and while it was entitled to 84 investigators, it had only 81. Therefore, it was short three. However, it is still in British Columbia that the best balance is achieved as concerns investigators.

And if I should pursue a little further my examination of statistics for the province of Quebec, especially those concerning unemployment in the city of Montreal, there, again, I will discover most interesting facts. For instance, in nine constituencies of the city of Montreal where unemployment is high, there are ten investigators. The constituencies of Hochelaga, Lachine, Bourassa, Laval, Saint-Denis and Saint-Jacques each have one; Maison-neuve-Rosemont and Saint-Henri have two each; and Papineau has none whatsoever. The unemployment rate shows a tendency to increase in nine constituencies and ten investigators are being assigned there to collect data.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Now, here is a contradictory picture. In the constituency of Ahuntsic, we find five investigators, in Durvernay, four; in Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, four also. Consequently, in those three constituencies, there are 13 investigators.

Now, in three constituencies where unemployment is declining 13 investigators can be found, and in nine constituencies where it shows an upward trend we find ten investigators. So, 13 investigators in three constituencies where unemployment is apparently going down will give a picture and compile comparatively misleading statistics, whereas ten investigators in nine constituencies where the opposite trend prevails will come up with statistics bound to give an erroneous picture of the unemployment situation.

The more we study statistics, especially when one is aware of the funny methods used to establish them, the more we see that speeches made on the unemployment rate prove irresponsible.

Why should the government refuse to take into account the figures provided by the manpower centres, even though they might be incomplete? Why is it that some public servants have been under orders to keep those figures confidential? The government is frightened because they do not want the public to know the real extent of the economic disaster that will result from their actions.

Let us give as few figures as possible and let us publish only those figures that are meaningless. Statistics are being "botched up" and we have seen, unfortunately, that the government is proposing "botched-up" solutions to the unemployment problem.

Since I first came to parliament I have known many a budget and I have always seen almost the same things: taxation budgets, bankruptcy budgets, unemployment budgets, budgets without foresight, "amateur" budgets, all soaking in speeches by so-called experts which always lead us to the same place—deeper and deeper down the economic drain.

An old French marshal once said that in all his life he had learned to distinguish three common factors, one of which was enough to lead a man or a businessman to bankruptcy. The first cause of bankruptcy, he said, often lies in an overconsumption of what is bottled in bond. The second cause is often an exaggerated love for women other than one's better half.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Rondeau:** —and the third one is government, which often lead us to bankruptcy. We should blame those so-called experts.

In 1971 even more than ever, he who talks does not pick the tab. Funnily enough, it seems that all members in this House, and especially those sitting on the government's side, are complete ignoramuses for the number of so-called experts around the ministers or in the cabinet increases everyday.

Mr. Speaker, financial experts are working for finance and the governments elected by it are at its service. Unfortunately governments make use of budgets such as the one before us tonight and such as the ones that will