

Alleged Failure of Employment Policies

lish or provide a program of full employment in Canada. Talk about full employment in Canada! I was told that certain members and even the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) asked the government to assist western farmers who have to cope with a wheat surplus. The solution proposed is to pay the wheat producers for not producing wheat, as there is too much of it already.

So, they are told: Sit quietly at home and we shall give you \$6 per acre left idle, up to a maximum of 1,000 acres. That means \$6,000 so that they will not produce any wheat. On the other hand, the members of the New Democratic Party suggest a full-employment policy.

On the one hand, assistance is requested in the form of grants so that some people will not produce and, on the other hand, full employment is advocated. Workers have jobs but we have too many products in all fields.

In the automobile industry, for instance, thousands of workers are being laid off because there are too many automobiles.

The problem is the same in the clothing and food industries: There is surplus production. Yet, at the same time, there are some who would introduce a motion to create more jobs, who would call for more production. But why produce so much? We cannot even now keep up the production in our plants because of excess goods. Yet some clamour for full employment.

Mr. Speaker, whoever advocates full employment is bluffing. It cannot be achieved if we accept automation. The only way we can achieve full employment is by setting aside science, progress, machines, development and going back to the days of the ox, small ploughs and oil lamps. Let us turn the clock 75 years back; and then perhaps, in view of our needs, we can achieve full employment. But with the use of machines, never.

That reminds me of a story I used to tell a few years ago. Some people wanted full employment and intended to fight the machine. For instance, we have seen under certain winter works projects, some municipalities keep machines and mechanical ploughs stowed away in their garages and warehouses in order to be able to give work to the unemployed in winter. The streets were cleared of snow with small shovels. Man was not smart enough to use the machine to improve the lot of man. The machine was stored and men were put to work like beasts of burden. And that was supposed to be reasona-

ble. There will still be some in Quebec, on April 29, who will vote for the Liberals or the Union Nationale. That is good enough for them.

There was once two men around a gravel pit watching a crane loading trucks. The trucks then drove away to unload this gravel which was used for road construction. One of the two unemployed, who were both carrying their own small shovels, said to the other: "Well, joe, without big crane, you and I might get a job as well as 50 guys like us. The machine punishes us."

The other one, who was far from stupid, answered: "Well, if it is only a matter of providing employment, instead of two guys like you and me, or even 50 guys each with a small shovel, why not hire 250 men with teaspoons? They would do just the same amount of work, and everybody would get a job."

As for me, I suggest that motions or resolutions such as the one now before us are just about as sensible as the reasoning of the man who wanted to replace the machine with teaspoons.

Mr. Speaker, the machine was devised to serve man and not to punish him. There is only one answer to the problem: it is to give to those replaced by machines enough purchasing power to enable them to buy the products made by the machine. It is as simple as that. However, people do not understand yet.

In the House, they talk about increasing productivity. As concerns the unemployed, we have not determined yet how many of them there are. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) said a while ago that there were 540,000 unemployed, whereas I read in yesterday's newspaper that they number 653,000, while some civil servants say 438,000. Anyway, we know that there are people out of work and that, on the other hand, there are too many products; nevertheless, some would like to find jobs for the unemployed in order to increase production. That is contrary to common sense.

In 1970, our national production will be worth \$72 or \$75 billion. Yet Canada's national income will total only \$52 or \$55 billion. This means a discrepancy of \$20 billion between our national income and our national production. The goods are there, but not the money.

And whenever we say that a dividend must be distributed to everybody to allow them to purchase such goods—which would allow industries to manufacture other goods,