

Business of the House

effort. Second, you need a first-class program to increase productivity in this country, to lower costs, lower selling prices, make our products more competitive against foreign products selling in the Canadian market and against Canadian products selling abroad. What has this government done to bring about an improvement in trade in those fields? It is a very simple answer, Mr. Speaker. This government has done absolutely nothing.

I am going to tell you why it is very clear the government has done absolutely nothing. As a start, they only have to look at the export figures for 1971. They will see that our exports for this year have increased by a mere and disgraceful 5 per cent. That is all. In order for our export industries to carry their load of providing the additional jobs that our rapidly growing work force needs each year, exports in this country must increase by an absolute minimum of 10 per cent a year. That is the absolute minimum. If they are not increasing by that amount, they are not producing the jobs that the people who should be employed in those industries should be getting year by year. It is as simple as that.

The most important part of our exports, of course, are the exports of fully manufactured goods. The breakdown between our manufacturers of unprocessed products, semiprocessed products and fully processed products is not available. It is in the process of being produced at the present time. Last year our increase of fully manufactured products was a very small percentage of the whole total. Of the increase of 15 per cent overall last year, the increase of unprocessed products was 31.8 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. I suggest to him that although I appreciate what he is attempting to do, the intent of his speech is obvious, obvious to the Chair in any event. He must make an effort to relate his remarks to the motion before the House which is a motion to adjourn the House. I know it is possible to relate an adjournment motion perhaps to a trade situation, if the hon. member wants to call it that. We cannot have a general debate on unemployment, a general debate on trade, and a general debate on every single subject of general interest. I think hon. members have a responsibility to make an effort to relate their remarks specifically and clearly to the motion before us.

Mr. Hees: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Naturally, I quite agree with what you say. I was simply trying to give this government something to go on in the next seven weeks when they are not going to have the benefit of our advice in Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: I am prepared, either here in my place or by going to talk to any of them, to outline exactly what should be done and what will work from a practical point of view. I quite agree that perhaps this is not the time to say it. I have given enough indication of the problems of fighting unemployment that face this government, problems that have not been faced by this government that need to be dealt with in the next seven weeks. I do not think there is any question about that.

There is also the question of preparing a program to fight inflation if inflation should start to rise even more

[Mr. Hees.]

rapidly than at the present time. This government has no program to combat inflation. Last time, their program was a joke. Management and labour laughed at it. The government brought in guidelines with no teeth in them. Management and labour laughed and nothing was done. The program was a complete failure.

It is obvious that in bringing in this motion for a seven week adjournment, all this Prime Minister and this cabinet want to do is get the opposition off their backs. The Prime Minister has a great disregard and disrespect for Parliament. He does not like us. He does not want us here. We are nobodies. We are troublesome to him. We bring him into the House each day and make him answer embarrassing questions. He does not like that.

It was interesting hearing the account of what the government had done during the past three and a half months. Everything was mentioned except what the government has done to solve the case of the leaks of six cabinet documents in six weeks and all they are going to do in the future. We look forward to hearing about that when we return. Sending us, people who are paid to come here, work and to do a job in Parliament, away for seven weeks—

Mr. McLraith: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Hees: I will answer your question later, George. We are paid to do a job in Parliament. We should be back here on January 21 advising the government, debating with the government and seeing that the government does its job, not pushed aside as the nobodies which the Prime Minister considers us to be, allowing him and his colleagues to be simply rid of us and away from all this embarrassing questioning.

When we do meet on February 16, you can imagine what kind of a program the government will have. There will be more of the vague generalities and the ideas away up on cloud nine that never come down to earth and never get into practical form. That is the only thing we will see. This country deserves an awful lot better than that. I ask the government to reconsider. Have some conscience about your duty to the country. Call us back in three weeks and we will show you what this country needs to put it on its feet.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may be deemed to yet have the floor. He will allow the hon. member to ask a question. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McLraith: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member's speech with some care. When he was referring to the duty of hon. members to be here this morning—

Mr. Hees: Not this morning.

Mr. McLraith: Was the hon. member referring to the 11 out of 12 of the frontbenchers in his party who are absent this morning or was he referring to his leader who has been away during all the important stages of the debate on the Farm Marketing Bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!