

Alleged Non-Support of Employment Programs

Assistance Plan were increased. I take the opposite view; I feel they would be substantially worse off.

The depressed areas of this country would benefit from such a proposal. That may not be an objection to the hon. member's proposal, but I think it should be weighed. I am prepared on occasion to recommend proposals that operate against the people of Toronto but are in the national interest. However, let us call a spade a spade. The suggestion that increasing the welfare ratio would somehow benefit the people of my city is entirely misdirected.

I now turn to argument No. 3, that the federal government should give more than the \$160 million that it offered to the municipalities of this country. I can deal with this argument very quickly. The hon. member states that there should be grants rather than loans. Whether there are grants or loans, the fact is that the very day these proposals were introduced offering \$160 million, British Columbia applied for its full share. A few days later Quebec applied for its share. Two or three days ago, months after the offer was made to the province and municipalities of this country, New Brunswick applied for its share.

What about the government of Ontario and the \$17 million that was promised to us? In our city we are faced with maximum unemployment and other terrible problems. Instead of accepting the offer which was made by the federal government, an offer which was good for British Columbia, good enough for Quebec and good enough in the maritime provinces, the government of Ontario has sat back without responding.

● (8:20 p.m.)

I was told by an alderman of the city of Toronto that the share which was to go to Toronto was not determined until February 4. The period between November, when this offer was made, and February was the period of maximum unemployment in our city, on a seasonally-adjusted basis. It was during that period, when other provinces were taking up the offer of the federal government, that Queen's Park was sitting back doing nothing. The hon. member for Spadina claimed that the city of Toronto itself was not offered anything, that it just went to metro.

I should like to point out that the \$17 million was offered to Ontario; the distribution was left to the provincial government. I do not know whether \$5 million eventually will go to Toronto, or \$3 million. As far as Toronto is concerned, the \$5 million offer has waited for three months. I know they have yet to come up with a scheme to use the \$3 million or \$5 million or, indeed, the \$17 million. In other provinces, where there is also unemployment, these funds are already at work. This is proposal No. 3 which the official opposition put forward—the only substantial proposal.

The hon. member for Spadina concluded by warning the Toronto members that a delegation was coming here from Toronto with a good idea and that we had better listen. We had some advance news of this idea because we went to Toronto, at the invitation of the mayor, a few weeks ago and were told of this proposal. I do not intend

[Mr. Kaplan.]

to "knock" the proposal but I want to put it into perspective. Toronto has come up with a proposal, in a city where 20,000 are unemployed, for putting 120 municipal workers back to work at a cost to the federal government of a grant of \$5 million. I am not saying we should not do something for these 120 workers but—

Mr. Deputy Spaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member may continue with unanimous consent. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Ricard: No.

Mr. Bell: He could go on for a sentence or two, like the rest.

Mr. Ricard: I did not give consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no agreement.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to rise in my place tonight to speak on this motion of non-confidence for the period ending March 26.

I congratulate my hon. friend from Spadina (Mr. Ryan) on advancing this non-confidence motion because of the serious, high incidence of unemployment which is now at a record high of almost 700,000, and because of the adverse situation into which the government has allowed the country to fall. The blame for this arises directly from the government policy, directly from the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) declared and often-quoted intention of last year when he stated that the amount of unemployment he invited or would tolerate in order, as he said, to combat inflation was 6 per cent, perhaps more.

The motion condemns the government for failing to foresee and provide for the escalating effects of this unemployment policy. That is true enough. The government has sown the wind and now it is reaping the whirlwind. The escalating effects of the Prime Minister's unemployment policy have had a degrading effect upon the responsible manhood and womanhood of the country. In the confusion and melée, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) declares: Oh, yes, we have a slightly embarrassing degree of unemployment, but we point out that we have raised unemployment benefits by a considerable degree. Mr. Speaker, it is not unemployment benefits that responsible, unemployed fathers and mothers and the unemployed youth of this country want when they are laid off their jobs. They want work, steady work.

Liberalism, in its constant deception of the Canadian people, is playing its nefarious game of region against region, province against province, race against race and, yes, sometimes capital against labour, and definitely government against labour. It is now reaching out unjustly to try to put some categories and professions into its unemployment insurance fund when they should not be there, and I refer directly to the teachers of this country.