

**Mr. Saltsman:** That would be a very heavy risk to run. That is really what we have to face, Mr. Speaker.

What is happening? I think one thing that is happening is that the causes of growth have changed. We are no longer in the same kind of world we were once in, a world in which growth was fueled by new frontiers or war. We do not want war or revolution to fuel growth. Growth was fueled by large numbers of children, family formations following the Second World War and for years afterwards. New households were formed, and this called for houses and for all kinds of other goods and services.

Growth was also fueled by immigration. Immigrants who came to this country, contrary to what some people think, created more jobs than they were supposedly to take away. They created a boom in our economy. We went through that, but now we have reduced immigration. There was a pent up demand that was there. There were inventions, such as radios, television. All kinds of things were invented. Now, rather than these inventions spurring on demand, they are creating such automated processes as to wipe out jobs. Many of the incentives which we provide for investment at the same time are destroying jobs that we are supposed to be creating.

This is something that will be on for a long time. I am not suggesting for one moment that we bring back the Luddites and smash up machinery; I am simply suggesting that we have to face the reality of a changing society. There was a time when we had cheap energy. We could do all kinds of things because we never worried about energy. But the days of cheap energy are over.

There was a time when people polluted the atmosphere. They did not care about the environment or the consequences of pollution. You had great productivity and you dumped all your waste into a river. We will not stand for that any more. You cannot live off nature in that particular way; things have changed.

There are many hon. members who have been thinking about these problems in the way I and my colleagues have been thinking about them. We have to face the fact that there are not going to be enough jobs to go around, certainly not with the kind of proposals which the government is putting forward. Even if the government were to listen to us, and I think it should, and it took the \$1.2 billion in its last budget which it is going to give away as tax incentives, and put it into direct job creation, the situation would improve. If it is going to get 50,000 jobs—although I think that is high—out of \$150 million worth of investment, Mr. Speaker, you can calculate how many more jobs it would get if it would put those incentives into direct job creation. The incentives have not demonstrated that they have been effective anyway; they have just been giveaways and have done very little good in terms of creating employment.

If that is the case, then we have to be thinking along some new lines. I see from this morning's paper that the American Congress and Senate have both decided to remove their clause stipulating compulsory retirement. We should be going the other way. We should be reorganizing our old age pensions to

*The Address—Mr. Saltsman*

make it optional for people to retire at an earlier age, in order to provide jobs for young people coming into the labour market.

In principle it sounds like a great idea to say no one should be forced to retire at 65—until you start to look at it. Who are the ones who are hanging on to their jobs at the age 65? They are the executives, the guys with the cushy jobs and the seniority, and they are not letting the others in.

**Mr. Fraser:** Some have brains and talent too.

**Mr. Saltsman:** Yes, they have brains and talent too. My colleagues should not get so excited, because any one of us may be forced to retire before 65. I know that the guy who works in the factory and really slugs it out, whether in an auto plant or in a textile mill, does not want to work after he is 65. He wants to get out of there and get something out of life for all those early mornings he got up, and for the hours of slugging that he put in, and he should be able to do that. I am surprised that my friends on the right took this as personal criticism because I did not intend it that way. I know I have some colleagues who are absolutely irreplaceable, and I would not dream of retiring them at 65. But they are the exceptions.

We are in danger of creating two classes of people in our society. To some extent this is already visible. We have those who have a job and are working, and those who do not have a job now and, unfortunately, in many parts of this country have no prospects of a job. Unless something dramatic happens, they look forward to a jobless youth, and perhaps even a jobless middle age.

What we do at the present time to take care of the situation, to the extent that we do take care of it, is not to provide jobs or look at ways of providing jobs. Rather we have something called the unemployment insurance fund. My leader has made it very, very clear that what this party wants are jobs, not welfare. Those people who are working, whether they understand it or not, are being taxed very, very heavily to pay for those who are not working. How much better to share that work to find a way of providing more employment, to create more of the good things through more people working. If we have to reduce the work week in order to do this, then we should be thinking about it.

Some people say, "Those terrible socialists! If we ever listened to them, they would want to have a very sharply graduated income tax; they really want to hit those guys at the top hard". In some ways that is true. We think that the guy at the bottom has had a rough deal for a long, long time. We think that rather than tax cuts, which do not help him very much, or only marginally, there should be tax credits or, as my friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) would argue, demogrant payments, direct payments to everyone.

**Mr. Woolliams:** But he won't retire.

**Mr. Nystrom:** He will in 10 years.