

paid considerably higher salaries, the unemployment level here is still too high. However, our rate of development, at 4.3 p. 100, is by far the highest of the industrialized nations of the western world. This excellent performance was the subject of an article in the most prestigious English paper, the *London Times*, which awarded Canada the highest distinction for the best all around economic evolution of all the industrialized countries in the western world.

According to the latest figures published by Statistics Canada, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate dropped from 6.7 per cent in April 1971 to 5.8 per cent in April 1972. During the same period, the number of unemployed decreased by 67,000.

This means that, in Canada, millions of workers are engaged in various occupations; each and every morning, these millions of workers leave for work as if they were moved by a mechanism which nobody can see, nor is aware of, and all the jobs they do are tied together like so many links of a chain with multiple branches, or like so many gears of a gigantic watch. This balance of the economy can only be attained if there is a close co-operation between the various industrial sectors in a free enterprise system, the trade unions and the state with its various levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, in view of all the measures put forward by the government, I fail to see any justification or seriousness in the amendment moved by the honourable member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) which reads as follows:

This House regrets the failure of the government to bring forth effective measures to relieve unemployment, to provide incentive for Canadian investment in Canadian development or to propose personal tax relief for stimulation of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, considering all the projects put forward by the federal government, I shall have to vote against the amendment.

• (1730)

[English]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, we have been told by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) that the major purpose of his budget presentation was to deal with unemployment. I believe the government will fail in its objective of dealing with unemployment, as it has since the year it was elected.

Before dealing with that matter, I want to say that I do not believe it was the major purpose of this budget. I think it was to placate the business community of this country which was dissatisfied with the Liberal government. That is why tax cuts of \$500 million are being given to the corporate sector of our economy. At the same time as the government refuses to give personal income tax cuts, it proposes to permit an increase of 3 per cent at the end of the year on personal income taxes. That is the real purpose of this budget. We in this party intend to make that the major point in the election campaign whether it comes this fall or in the spring of 1973. I refer to the government so favourably and one-sidedly dealing with the corporate sector of this country.

We have been told by the Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) and the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy) how successfully the government is dealing with unemployment. The fact is

The Budget—Mr. Orlikow

that with the exception of two months, for two years we have consistently had 6 per cent or more unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis. It is true that in April, 1972, the seasonally adjusted rate dropped to 5.8 per cent, but that was still the highest rate of unemployment in any country in the western world.

I see that the hon. member for Laval is leaving the chamber. I wish he would stay for another few moments. I want to remind him that 216,000 people in the province of Quebec were unemployed in April, 1972. He may be satisfied with that record. I am not surprised that the Parti Quebecois, the party which wants to separate, divide and destroy this country, in a recent drive had the greatest financial success it has had in its history. When there are 216,000 people unemployed in the province of Quebec it is not surprising that the people of that province are dissatisfied with federalism, Canada and the Liberal government.

An hon. Member: Are you happy about that?

Mr. Orlikow: No, I am not happy about it. I wish you people would do something about it instead of saying that everything is great. Let us look at the unemployment figures. In April, 1972, there were 250,000 people between the ages of 14 and 24 who were unemployed. These are the best educated young people this country has ever seen. Because I do not like to talk in round figures, let me tell hon. members about a visit to my office yesterday afternoon by one of my constituents.

This young lady received her BA at the University of Manitoba in May, 1970. She spent a year in the faculty of education at the University of Manitoba and completed teacher's training in May, 1971, one year ago. She was not able to get a teaching job in the province of Manitoba, and came to Ottawa. The only work she has been able to get is as a substitute teacher on very few occasions. She told me yesterday that one of her mistakes is that she has not lied to prospective employers. She told them how well educated she is. For most jobs she is over-educated. She feels that the only thing she can do now is try to get a job as a cashier in one of the supermarkets in this city.

This is a sad commentary for a society which has spent tens of thousands of dollars to train a young woman to be a teacher and she cannot get any job except possibly as a cashier in a supermarket. In spite of this, members opposite are happy about the state of our economy.

Let us look at what the Minister of Finance proposes with his budget. If you bring in a budget with the hope of expanding the economy and providing employment, you have two choices. First, you can cut personal income taxes. Is there any member of this House who doubts that personal income tax cuts, particularly for those in the low and middle income brackets, would mean an immediate expenditure of virtually all that money for goods and services which these people need? Anything given in the form of a tax cut for those who earn \$12,000 a year or less—and that is the vast majority of the people in this country—would be spent. These people cannot afford to save money. Did the minister do that? Of course not. What he did was cut the rate of corporation taxes to 40 per cent and provided for another round of fast writeoffs on machinery purchases.