

Employment Support Bill

If salesmen are ogling to sell insurance or work successfully in offices, they must obtain the confidence of their clients or customers. I have never heard of selling anything or working out a diplomatic deal by kicking a fellow in the shins, unless one is such a bully he will kick the man so hard that he never gets up. Canadians do not believe in that kind of diplomacy. We must remember what Mr. Trudeau said, that we are sleeping with an elephant. I, for one, would not want to kick an elephant in the shin, particularly if I wanted to get along with him. I do not think the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) believes in that philosophy, although it sounds good on the hustings. Perhaps it is an easy way to get votes, but kicking the so-and-so out of the United States does not solve anything. Some leaders have been trying this for years. Some dictators have followed policies to build up hate.

Mr. Zink went on to state:

The kicks were calculated to be particularly painful in the sensitive areas of foreign defence and trade policies.

For good measure, some of Prime Minister Trudeau's ministers (for example, Joe Greene in his Denver speech) went out of their way to add insult to injury.

I might suggest the Minister of Finance has a credibility gap as big as the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and of course there is a lot of pollution there. The finance minister is polluting the Canadian economic stream just as effectively as we have polluted our environment.

Mr. Zink went on to say:

Instead, the Trudeau government, which has done its foolish utmost in helping the totalitarians to push the U.S. into political and strategic isolation, is rushing a delegation to Washington to plead for exemption from the Nixon-announced import restrictions on account of the interdependence and, for all practical intents and purposes, the indivisibility of our two economies.

Mr. Kipling in the *Financial Times* of August 23, 1971 said:

Insiders said that the government had no choice but to dispatch a mission to Washington to protest and to argue Canada's case. To do nothing seemed politically disastrous; to have gone cap in hand would have been humiliating and useless; to threaten would have been inviting a trade war.

Let me quote now what Mr. Malcolm Montgomery of Toronto said in a letter published in the *Globe and Mail* on August 20, 1971:

It is difficult to perceive how the leaders of our two countries could work in the spirit of friendly co-operation when they do not have personal contact.

Many times since this government has been in office I have asked whether it was prepared to extend an invitation to the President of the United States to visit Canada. During my time we have had the privilege and the pleasure of hosting a visit by Eisenhower, at which time many of our economic problems were worked out. We then had the privilege and pleasure of a visit by the late President Kennedy. I could look up the date in *Hansard* when I asked the question, whether Nixon would be invited to Canada. It shows that the Prime Minister brushed aside the suggestion and said no. This government is now on its knees and wants the President to make a visit to this country.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Montgomery went on to state in his letter:

Prime Minister Trudeau seems to be busy planning trips to China, Russia, Yugoslavia and the West Indies, and yet he does not find time to go as far as Washington.

President Nixon has re-acquainted our government in Ottawa with the realities of life. Our government cannot be nationalistic and anti-American in one moment and continentalism the next. Friendship is a two-way relationship.

This government has to mend its ways and work out its problems with the United States in a diplomatic, logical and economic way. On many occasion we have asked the United States for exemptions in respect of certain taxes and those problems have been worked out. What has taken place in the past has been the result of diplomacy. Perhaps this government should enlist the assistance of a former leader, Mr. Pearson. He was a man of diplomacy and did not insult his neighbours. We cannot talk to the United States as this Prime Minister has and then send our boys to Washington with their hats in their hands in the hope of working something out.

An hon. Member: Perhaps we should send Dief.

Mr. Stanfield: Let's turf them out. Never mind Ben, send him down permanently.

Mr. Woolliams: If \$80 million will provide a solution, then I suggest this is peanuts. If the government really believes in this plan, why set the amount at \$80 million? If we can afford \$600 million or \$700 million to establish an airport we should pour more money into this project to save the jobs of Canadians and preserve our industries for our future generations. When we hear that there may be another 10,000 persons laid off in three months in this area and 10,000 in that area, when we talk about \$80 million to stimulate industry this is totally acceptable because social welfare for unemployed will cost more. I would like to have the figure this afternoon, which is not ascertainable at the moment, to show what welfare costs Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, Hamilton and all the other centres of Canada. If in the next few months those figures do not add up to what the government is trying to offer industry, then I believe I could back up the argument about this program being just a bag of peanuts thrown out. The government has frightened industry for the past three years with talk of tax reform. They held out the idea that there would be a tough tax policy and then retreated by introducing a bill which, as the Canadian Bar Association said, when the Bill was drafted only the drafters and God understood it, now only God knows what it means. That is the atmosphere in which business has to operate today.

● (4:00 p.m.)

Had the government come in with tax cuts and incentives to industry much of this trouble with management and labour, as well as many of the problems in respect of competition with the rest of the world and in Canada would have been solved. The real situation is that the government is not going to take the responsibility for this peanut program. It is to be handed over to a board. We do not know what it is to be. They say it is nothing. It