

The men employed at this plant represent a technology which has been based on the needs of the defence industry and cannot be assimilated in the local economy.

I repeat the words "cannot be assimilated".

This, despite your communication to me of June 24 that there would be no decrease in the defence budget.

The direct livelihood of 1,600 citizens of our community which represents approximately 4 per cent of our total population is at stake.

We expect immediate action from your government to resolve this crisis.

It goes on to speak about the concern of the community. One impression was clearly left, as referred to by both the mayor of the city of Dartmouth and the Premier of Nova Scotia, and indeed it is an impression I have had based on questions in the House and correspondence with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) with regard to government policies concerning economic conditions, particularly as they relate to defence spending in our area. That impression is that this government would take no action whatsoever as a result of internal defence programming or policy which would have a detrimental effect on the economy of our area. This is so. There is no question that the situation in which Fairey Aviation finds itself is the result of the de-escalation of defence spending and defence programming.

I want to make one or two points as a preamble before I ask my basic and short questions. Again, I do not expect the parliamentary secretary to answer this question, but I think it is important. I should like to quote from a speech made by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) at a time when he was ardently seeking that job. He made the speech in Hamilton in June of 1968. Part of it reads as follows:

In a rapidly changing economy workers sometimes lose their jobs because of major changes in government programs and policies. These workers are entitled to reasonable income maintenance benefits if they cannot find other jobs in their own vicinity and if for some reason they cannot benefit from the government's retraining and relocation program.

The key words there are "reasonable income maintenance benefits", and the fact that they cannot benefit from the govern-

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

ment's retraining and relocation program is important. The Prime Minister went on to say:

Given the nature of the skills of these employees, it would seem that they could not be easily absorbed in the community. Nor, for a variety of good reasons not the least of which is the long duration of their employment in one type of work, can I see them all being usefully and quickly retrained. This leaves relocation. Only one brief comment about relocation. When it is involuntary, we have clear evidence of our failure.

My brief comment is simply that when relocation is involuntary, our system of government has failed abjectly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just put before the House a matter which he holds dear, and rightly so, since it concerns the employment of several persons affected by the closing down of a company. Still, I wonder exactly to what department the question was directed. I believe it concerns the Minister of Defence (Mr. Cadieux) and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand).

I know that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration wishes to give a full answer to the hon. member. He apologizes for being absent this evening. Although he is back from the Maritimes, he was unable to get here soon enough to answer the question.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion are deeply interested in the hon. member's question, as well as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) who would like unemployment insurance to be available to those employees. I believe that was the point of the question of the hon. member, namely whether those employees would be able to get unemployment insurance benefits.

● (10:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.31 p.m.