

the cameras and roasted by the lights. I trust that the committee which made the arrangements for this innovation in parliament will continue meeting, and meeting with some urgency, to see whether the level of illumination in this place cannot be reduced. We were told during the debate on televising this place that it would serve the purpose of keeping the seats full, but I know that very few members of parliament can bear sitting in their seat longer than an hour and a half without some shading or screen for their eyes. If anything, television has had the opposite effect and is emptying the seats in this place. However, one thing I can say is that the increased illumination has added no brilliance to the performance of the government opposite. It has thrown no light or clarity on its deliberations whatsoever, and has added no lustre to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet as the days have gone by.

I am concerned about some of the changes which have resulted already. One of those was the failure for any procedural wrangle to develop when it became apparent that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) was going to add something to the rules of this House by running in, on top of the debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, a budget without the usual warning and preparation and allotted days for a budget debate.

I believe very firmly that in the pre-televising days there would have been a group of members led by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who would have tied up the proceedings of this chamber for at least three days as a protest. One of the things we have yet to see in the televised House is a full-fledged procedural wrangle. I trust that the precedent set in the opening weeks will not be followed and that hon. members will have the courage, when the government breaches long-standing traditions of this chamber, to argue, to defend the rights of the opposition and to attack such actions by the government in the future.

I can understand the urgency on the part of the Minister of Finance in wanting to bring in a budget—which is not a budget—in order to undo some of the things done by his predecessor who could not stand it any longer and left the position. With the rate of unemployment across the country, and the shocking rate of unemployment in British Columbia, in the Okanagan Valley from where I come and in other parts of British Columbia as well, it is no wonder that the minister attempted to promise at least some further alleviation.

I know that some of the measures he proposed are supposed to provide some alleviation and that there are clauses in the income tax bill we are discussing today which were placed there to encourage business to expand. But I am sure anyone listening to that mini-budget had a sudden apprehension on learning that there would be an additional \$150 million applied to job-creation. I am sure that I am not alone in feeling that the present job-creation programs through Canada Works and Young Canada Works programs are not the way to solve the unemployment problem in this country. We need something far more sophisticated than short-range projects which are put forward by groups of citizens who very often do

not have a great deal of administrative experience but yet are being awarded fairly large sums of money.

The wonder is that the projects work as well as they do; but there are too many which cannot be undertaken, and there are too many organizations, including organizations at the municipal level of government, which are frustrated to see what, to them, would be significant sums of money bypassing them because they cannot manage to fit into the criteria laid out in the programs. I cite the example of the interior exhibition association at Armstrong, British Columbia, which would very much like to expand its facilities and to build a new and large exhibition complex to take care of the huge crowds which now show up for that great annual event. When they applied to the Department of Agriculture, they learned that grants for the construction of exhibition buildings were cut off in 1962, so there are no more. They were told that they could borrow at a reasonable rate of interest, but that does not prevent considerable frustration developing as they see grants that would be significant to them utilized elsewhere, and very often for the short-term in the local area.

I realize that the Canada Works program is now inviting private participation, and I would hope that for that kind of project it would be possible for an association such as that to arrange this matter with the contractor—because the problem lies in the kind of supervisory effort that is needed for a building of that size—who in turn would be able to pick up some people from the ranks of the unemployed and use them at least on the preliminary work that would be necessary. I feel that there would be room for changing the nature of the Canada Works program to allow more direct use of the money and to allow for greater supervision over what is done with it.

We note, too, that at the municipal level great problems arise in terms of the conflicts with municipal unions and the Canada Works program, and those problems have not been sorted out. We know that the minimum wage and the beginning wage for municipal employees does not mesh with the standard for the works program. A great deal needs to be done there. We are in a difficult situation in this country. The economic climate of the country is affected in terms of the minimum wage here versus that in the United States. Even so, we are conscious of what unexamined acceptance of an ever-increasing minimum wage has done in terms of creating unemployables. One can find in a recent issue of *Time* magazine, for example, Riesman, the sociologist, being quoted as saying that the minimum wage is the product of—

—an alliance of the better situated labour unions with the liberals against the deprived and the elderly whom people would otherwise employ for household or city work that now doesn't get done.

In the most recent issue we learn that the U.S. Congress voted to boost the minimum wage from its present \$2.30 an hour to \$3.35 by 1981, and one notes with a bit of surprise that the minimum wage there will not surpass ours, assuming that the one in Canada will stay still until January of 1980. The other day, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) cited some figures to indicate how the devalued Canadian dollar changed all that, but we should remember that what