

*Correspondence on Surcharges*

to provide for the development of industry not now available to Canada. They must do this in the best manner possible. However, in order to do it I suggest that labour and management themselves, and free enterprise as well, will not be able to solve the problems with which we are now faced in this nation.

Countries across the world—and I have read some of the legislative aims of countries like Sweden, Great Britain, France and others—lament very loudly if they have 2 per cent unemployment. Yet we have never been able to solve our unemployment problem. There are many in Canada who say that 4 per cent might be a reasonable unemployment figure. I suggest that 4 per cent may be a reasonable figure for some people, but not for anyone who is unemployed. However, other countries which have gone into the planning of industrial and labour management and government co-operative programs for advancing the economic development of their countries, are not satisfied with 2 per cent but are passing legislation similar to that which we have before us tonight and other legislation which will be before us during this session. They are passing legislation of this type to see that the unemployment situation in their countries is maintained at a much lower level than 2 per cent. I therefore think we must look to some of the plans that are being made in other countries in order to get a solution for some of our problems.

The hon. member for Kootenay East also mentioned two other major problems tonight, automation and mechanization and he attacked them, I presume, from a management position. I have seen the same problem in the mining field from a labour point of view. I would suggest that mechanization itself was never a bad thing but that automation was always a bad thing as far as the miners were concerned. At no time in my experience in the mining field was management ever able to take advantage of automation and bring to the workers and the community the benefits of automation itself.

I remember when the miners used to work with very ineffectual tools, when they used tools made of standard steel without carbide bits and other additives that have now made mining much simpler for the miner. They had old, heavy, antiquated machines and mucked by hand rather than by mucking machines. These things, too, I saw; but at the time equipment of this antiquated type was being used we had a fairly healthy community with a large section of the population employed in the mines. But the result of machines replacing men has been that the community

is now existing with two thirds fewer men employed and those who are employed find themselves not much better off in dollars and cents. Their take-home pay only provides them with a decent standard of living without improving conditions for them as the years have gone by. You now have a ratio of one employee supporting the town where previously there were two or three.

This has meant that the communities have been very hard pressed. I believe this is one of the major problems of automation, the fact that we have communities dependent upon one industry, particularly a basic industry, which has had a large amount of automation brought into it in recent years. The words "mechanization" and "automation" have been greatly misunderstood. I think it would be most interesting for the committee to give some consideration to a speech made by Walter Reuther, international president of the auto workers, on the impact of automation. He said:

Through the application of mechanical power to machinery, and the development of new machinery to use this power, the first industrial revolution made possible a vast increase in the volume of goods produced for each man-hour of work. Succeeding technological improvements—such as the development of interchangeable parts and the creation of the assembly line, which were essential to the growth of mass production industries—have led to continuous increases in labour productivity. But however much these machines were improved, they still required workers to operate and control them. In some operations, the worker's function was little more than to feed the material in, set the machine in operation and remove the finished product. In others, proper control of the machine required the exercise of the highest conceivable skills. But whether the required skill was little or great, the presence of a human being, using human judgment, was essential to the operation of the machine.

I think we should note there that a re-training program that will train our young people to fill their role in the light of increasing mechanization and give them the skills necessary to integrate them into a mechanized economy is something that can be done, but with automation that is not possible. He went on to say:

The revolutionary change produced by automation is its tendency to displace the worker entirely from the direct operation of the machine, through the use of automatic control devices. No one, as far as I know, has yet produced a fully satisfactory definition of automation, but I think John Diebold came close to expressing its essential quality when he described automation as "the integration of machines with each other into fully automatic and, in some cases, self-regulating systems."

In other words, automation is a technique by which whole batteries of machines, in some cases almost whole factories and offices, can be operated according to predetermined automatic controls. The raw material is automatically fed in, the machine automatically processes it, the product is automatically taken away, often to be fed automatically