

Employment Support Bill

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have just about reached the end of the question period. Perhaps the hon. member for Peace River might ask his supplementary.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the apparent ineffectiveness of the actions of the government overseas with regard to these issues, will the government review its policy of neo-isolationism, enlivened with occasional jet diplomacy, of doubtful value and see if it cannot obtain a better opportunity to make proper representations which will be heard in the capitals of the world?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether that question as asked is in proper form.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT BILL****MEASURE TO MITIGATE EFFECT ON CANADIAN
INDUSTRY OF IMPOSITION OF FOREIGN IMPORT
SURTAXES**

The House resumed from Thursday, September 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Pepin that Bill C-262, to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Saltsman (page 7633).

[Translation]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night, I was saying that the federal government should manage its affairs according to a formula of income, expenditures and revenue, while in personal, family, social, corporate, municipal and provincial affairs, the formula production, consumption and capitalization should be applied.

The national production must be adequate to meet the needs of the citizens as well as of the required capitalization for the security and development of the country. Broadly speaking the Canadian economy is doing well although many citizens, many families cannot benefit from the vast resources of the national production.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) clearly proved it in his account. He gave us a description of our economic situation. He said that our national production in 1971 had reached \$91 billion, and if our economy succeeded in reaching such a high level of production due to technology and scientific development, I will point out to the minister that if we have a production of \$91 billion, on the other hand we only have a consumption of \$54 billion. We consume 60 per cent of our production, and that owing to our exports which in the main go to the United States.

And if Bill C-262 is being discussed today, it is because we have produced too much and have not consumed

[Mr. Sharp.]

enough. Exports and consumption accounted for only 60 per cent of our production. Now we have capitalized close to \$37 billion out of a production of \$91 billion, namely 40 per cent. So I suggest that our capitalization is unduly high and that we do not consume enough. Therefore, if we are to solve our problem, we will have to organize our economy so that we can consume more. Although our production increases at such a rate, we have thousands of unemployed in Canada and thousands of citizens are welfare recipients. Consequently those people do not produce.

• (12:00 noon)

If our entire economy was geared to help the people, that is if all the citizens worked, our production could reach \$100 billion. Our natural resources are quite sufficient to provide the necessary primary products. This is precisely when the government indirectly intervenes. Since there is overproduction and under-consumption, the government intervenes and it would rather pay people to remain idle by giving them unemployment insurance benefits and welfare allowance, in order not to increase further the volume of our production.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the members that before we overcapitalize we must have a sufficient level of consumption. That is one of our major problems. One should feed the living before developing instruments and cope with the present before making reserves for the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, that is where we should come in. Yesterday I was in agreement with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. LaSalle) when he called for the establishment of some kind of board, of groups of citizens to meet and study the economic situation in Canada. However, such study should be carried out rationally. We cannot blame nature for not supplying human beings with all they need. God bestowed everything on nature, and in plenty; there has always been too much for everyone and enough for each one.

The board should include experts, engineers, economists, university professors, political men, officials of banks, companies, the stock exchange, trust companies, associations, unions, presidents and advisors of all big intermediary groups, movements and political parties.

Why then admit our inability to control a situation dependent upon us, our direction, our influence, our policy and our economic methods that have been wrong for several decades? Instead of defending established positions and their now alarming results, let us declare the status quo. Let us calmly recognize the general state of the whole national economy that is based on natural resources and the requirements of all Canadians considering the aim of economic activity and the unlimited production means at our disposal. That is what the board the minister created should do and be. It should not be a board to stand between the government and industry in an attempt to expand exports to the United States, to lessen American restrictions, but rather a real economic commission socially oriented to effectively solve Canadian problems.

It is up to us to solve those problems, Mr. Speaker. If our production and financing methods are fully effective, our wealth distribution methods are just as marvelous for Canadians who are employed, but there remains to effect