

Proposed Committee on Unemployment

as they should. It might also be a misdirection of shipments such as we had listed in farming periodicals, where it is sometimes related a carload of grain is shipped to one port and then has to be sent off to another.

On the other hand, the workman may sometimes be equally wrong. I was rather surprised in this connection to hear the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) say it was wrong for an industry to shut down. I am wondering whether it is not just as wrong sometimes for labour to force the shutdown of a plant and thereby affect the whole economy of the country. Mind you, I do not say it is wrong, but I am wondering if the same code does not apply to labour as to management in that particular regard.

The effect of unemployment on business, whether it be caused by strikes or by management or anything else, is already clear. The businessman is affected in so far as he is afraid to invest more capital in his business. We often face this argument as to which group is right, and that was illustrated in a newspaper very recently when we had an argument between labour leaders and the government as to the actual figure regarding the number of unemployed.

Statements on this question are sometimes considered to be radical in nature, and I sometimes wonder whether the people who are trying to correct this labour situation should not stop and ask themselves this question. What would you do if you were affected? Suppose, for example, you came to the government and said you wanted help, and they said you had better get a job elsewhere, as there were no jobs in your locality. Just what would you do? A man comes along then and says: If you come into our union group we will look after your interests. Whether they are communist-led or not is immaterial. The important thing is that they have a leader. They have someone to lead them, someone who will make representation on their behalf to the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can talk to some people but you cannot talk reasonably to a man with an empty stomach. He has a right to live. It has often been said that hungry people are very dangerous people, and that hungry people often start wars. It is the "have-nots" who want what the "haves" possess. I therefore submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the responsibility of this government to see to it that we do not have this hungry element among us. We are just breeding a communistic group of people so long as we allow this condition to continue.

I contend it is the business of the government to regulate the economy of our country

[Mr. Hahn.]

so that the absolute minimum number of people are deprived of the privilege of working. These people do not expect the government to find jobs for them, but they do expect the opportunity of finding jobs if they wish to apply for them. We must find the means of getting a job to them.

Labour claims that \$24 or under per week is too little to live on. I think every hon. member in this house realizes that if a home owner buys one of these national housing homes we propose to build he is going to require practically that entire sum to meet payments in the form of rents, taxes, water and light. It is not sufficient to keep him alive. We have a reserve of \$900 million or more in the unemployment insurance fund, and if we were to divide that among these people on the basis of a living wage it probably would not last for more than a year and a half.

What can we do, then? This problem which faces us at the present time is one to which we must find the answer; otherwise it is going to swallow us all up.

And what about the man who has not worked long enough for benefits? He has to live. You cannot tell him, Well, move along, bub. We will build you a soup kitchen and let you have some food. They do not want bread alone. They do not want a canopy of words put around them. They want enough to live on, and you have to give it to them. Perhaps I should not say "give it to them", for I do not believe people want anyone to give them anything. All they want is the means of obtaining it, unless this communistic idea is so instilled in them that they think of these things as theirs by right.

We also have the question of requiring the building industry to process its own raw materials, a sort of Canada-first policy. Here is another dangerous feature in their demands, for they want us to build industries and they want a guaranteed wage. This also is a part of their Canada-first policy; and yet if we told them we were going to bring in electric equipment from Japan or Germany or from somewhere else they again claim it should be Canada-first and the equipment should be built here in order to provide jobs.

The problem has to be solved in such a way that we can regulate employment, do away with unemployment and do our trading in such a way that we can get rid of our surpluses. I know the government will probably say: "You have put your finger upon the problem we are up against, young man." I am fully aware of that, and I am quite certain in my own mind that there is an answer, provided we are ready to look