

The Leader of the Opposition asked a few questions about possible measures which he, presumably, might put in place. I do not know why he would ask if he did not mean to say that he would put them in place. He has some possible measures to remedy the situation. He says, "Maybe we should look at special export programs". Does the Leader of the Opposition not realize that the dollar at its current level is one of the greatest spurs to the export of Canadian goods? We are seeing that in terms of the improvement in practically every sector of our economy, and as a result we have a \$3.5 billion surplus in trade for this country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lang:** The Leader of the Opposition insists on referring to a deficit of \$11 billion in what he calls manufactured products. He insists on referring only to the end product figure and ignoring, as my colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) has pointed out, such manufactured list goods as steel, cement, paper and lumber which move out in a form that does not put them in the end product category. But when those products are taken into account we are in a surplus position of \$3.5 billion rather than a deficit position of \$11 billion.

I have not, nor has the Minister of Finance, ever made light of the kinds of problems which face this country in a troubled world. But I think it is fair to say that the Leader of the Opposition does a real disservice when he sounds off about a deficit under the heading of manufacturing by using an end product figure to obtain a deficit, when the figure in terms of manufactured goods as a whole shows a surplus of \$3.5 billion. That is important news of the kind which the governor of the Bank of Canada, if the Leader of the Opposition had been in committee to hear him, would say might have a good impact upon the whole economy and our dollar rather than a bad effect, as do the kinds of wild statements made by members opposite and by the hon. member for York-Simcoe in particular.

The Leader of the Opposition in this case follows the hon. member for York-Simcoe. I thought when I heard the hon. member for York-Simcoe say that that he would have a different view from the Leader of the Opposition, in keeping with their current practice, but I guess, as somebody phrased it, it is tweedledum and tweedledummer. I would have thought that when I heard the hon. member for York-Simcoe suggest that we go for a temporary import surcharge or some form of import duty, we would at least have heard a westerner, who should remember something about what tariffs do to our whole economy, rebuke his colleague for saying such a thing. But he would actually suggest temporary import charges at a time when our dollar value has made it easier for our goods to compete at home and abroad. He would do so in the face of some worrisome words in our friendly country to the south that they may think of a similar measure when they have as serious problems or more serious problems than ours in terms of balance of payments.

**An hon. Member:** They are thinking about it.

### *Currency Devaluation*

**Mr. Lang:** If they are thinking about it, then surely it is in our Canadian interest to resist that, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will do in the highest circles of the world in keeping with an agreement made by the leaders of the seven countries that they would do everything they could to keep away from restraint measures and attempts simply to back the unemployment or developmental problems of one area into another. We want an open world with freer and freer trade and no temporary measures which would restrict that trade either within our country or outside it.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York-Simcoe are also guilty of misleading language when they use the expression that money is spent in connection with the defence of the Canadian dollar or action in relation to the Canadian dollar. It is transformed from one form of dollar to another—from American dollars in our hands to Canadian dollars—traditionally when we are guarding against uneven movements in a downward direction, and back the other way—from Canadian dollars into American dollars—when we are guarding against uneven movements in an upward direction. That policy of trying to use the currency exchange reserves in order to even flows and avoid fast movements is clearly very important.

This country is by and large in excellent economic shape.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gillies:** Let's go to the people on that one.

**Mr. Alexander:** When is the election, Otto?

**Mr. Lang:** We continue to have a serious challenge on the employment front where we are trying to spur the economy as much as possible to provide jobs, and we are providing jobs now at a year over year rate of 450,000, a rate which outdistances any other country in the world.

One might ask what does 450,000 jobs mean? Is it a large figure or is it a small figure? If one compares it to the actual growth in our population of 205,000 over that same 12-month period, it is quite significant. As a result Canadians are on average and individually—

**Mr. Alexander:**—getting sick of this government.

**Mr. Lang:**—better off in their standard of living day by day, week by week and year by year, even in the challenges we face in this economy of ours in a difficult world. That is why we see more Canadians travelling generally, but particularly travelling abroad, and that is why it contributes to our balance of payments problems as well. It has not been the policy of this government, and we would avoid such a policy, to restrict Canadians in how they invest or travel. We do encourage them to travel in Canada and to buy in Canada. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that perhaps we ought to do that. Perhaps he has not noticed that we have designed to do that, that we have a tourist program specifically designed to attract more and more Canadians to travel in this country.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Like Trudeau to Colorado.