

compared that to the poor records of Germany, Italy and Great Britain.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): What about Japan?

Mr. Danforth: I will include Japan, but that is not comparing the same thing. In Japan, they do not grant money and incentives for people to count canaries crossing a road or to photograph the cooking of spaghetti in colour. In that country, jobs are counted on the basis of productivity and this is where the difference lies. If we had a comparison of job to job and productivity to productivity, this would not reflect credit on the government.

One of the reasons we are in trouble in this country as far as this program of incentives is concerned is that government departments seem to be working at cross purposes. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) brought up the matter of sugar refineries. We have the Department of Revenue criticizing the sugar refineries because they are a cartel and may be fixing prices. Then, we have the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce chastising the sugar companies because they are only running from 62 per cent to 68 per cent capacity. There is a third policy under which the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is granting thousands of dollars for the promotion of new sugar refining capacity in this country. There are three different policies coming from three different departments, so naturally there is uneasiness and confusion.

Mr. Speaker, under the coherent and complete industrial policy suggested by my leader we could make some progress. We are not making progress now because this government is not consistent. Imports of food into this country are growing. Agriculture is a large industry which employs a lot of people, but under the policy of this government we have imports from offshore and labour from offshore and large expenditures of Canadian money are spent in this manner. The policies do not help the industry of agriculture to compete. Indeed, the policy of this government is one of retreat. They say "If we cannot compete let us move the farmers off the farms". They say, "Let us cut down the agricultural industry; let us withdraw support. Let us retreat until the agricultural industry can live with all this importation."

• (1720)

The same may be said of the textile industries. The government thinks it provides incentives to the textile industry when it says, "You cannot compete with the producers of other nations; we will determine what textiles you should produce; and whether your factories may expand and employ more people. Any difficulties with tariffs you may bring to us, and we will determine if you are to be allowed to make a certain product." That is the type of incentive program this government has embarked upon. On programs like that, Canadian taxpayers spend millions of dollars. Actually, we spend \$2 billion on incentives, a great deal of money. Mr. Speaker, nobody can imagine \$1 billion. I cannot imagine \$1 billion. I do not know if you would need a box car or a house to store \$1 billion in dollar bills. I know this, however: If you put a person of 18 to work counting \$1 billion, and he counted, say, one dollar bills at the rate of 100 per hour, he could

Employment Incentive Programs

retire at 65 without having counted half that money. That is how much \$1 billion is. In this country, we have spent \$2 billion on incentives. What did we get for our money except the highest unemployment Canada has ever seen. That is what we got.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Speaker, we have spent \$2 billion, or \$100 for every man, woman and child in Canada. That is what this country invested in this government's program, and it is not working. The government has criticized us for bringing forward this motion and for being critical of the incentive program.

Mr. Gillespie: Can the hon. member name one country that has done better than Canada?

Mr. Danforth: The minister asks me to name one country that has done better. If we were as interested in Canadians as we are, and as interested in Canada's future, we should all be better off. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in Canadian jobs, not Japanese jobs, not Italian jobs, not British jobs, not German jobs; I am interested in Canadian jobs, as the government ought to be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Faulkner: This is the House of Commons, not a campaign platform.

Mr. Danforth: We are buying catastrophe with the money spent. We are telling industries to go where they would not normally establish themselves, because economic conditions are wrong. And what will happen, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Faulkner: I doubt if the hon. member can answer that.

Mr. Danforth: Once we stop giving grants to induce factories and industries to move to submarginal areas, and once economic conditions return to normal, those factories and industries will not stay, because economic conditions will be against them. Every businessman in Canada knows this. I cannot understand why this fact has escaped the government.

My colleague showed that we are not creating new jobs, merely transferring jobs. We increase employment in one region and decrease it in another region, proof of which is this: Our total unemployment is not falling. I suspect we are not being given the true unemployment picture in this country, and this bothers me.

Mr. McCutcheon: Aha! Now, we come to the nub.

Mr. Danforth: The government talks about a 6 per cent unemployment rate. That figure represents only those who are drawing unemployment insurance. Does it include those who are being retrained? I believe 90,000 people are undergoing retraining. Does it include students who are looking for jobs, who have never worked and who, therefore, are not registered as unemployed? Although the government talks about 500,000 or 600,000 people being unemployed, I have as much right as hon. members opposite to suspect that one million Canadians