

The Budget—Mr. Alexander

Mr. Perrault: A government which invested over \$1 billion in housing last year—is that a “heartless” government?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Perrault: A government which has spent \$245 million on manpower training—should that be described as a “disastrous” program?

Mr. Orlikow: Yes.

Mr. Perrault: What about the creation of 17,312 jobs last year through regional expansion, and thousands of additional jobs which resulted from the establishment of these basic jobs in the economy? What about \$96 million spent on bringing about jobs for the constituents of every member of the opposite side of the House? Is that a “cruel” program?

Mr. Olikow: Yes.

Mr. Perrault: Tell that to Reilly, and say it to your constituents.

Mr. Orlikow: I will say it to the unemployed.

Mr. Perrault: What about the \$50 million which the Canada Pension Plan paid out in the 1969-70? Presumably this is a “reactionary” and “technocratic” plan.

Mr. Orlikow: It is.

Mr. Perrault: And a 10 per cent increase in unemployment insurance benefits?—I could continue this list of helpful government measures. I have another list of adjectives for our friends on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to describe their kind of descriptive statements. These words, too, are to be found in the *Thesaurus* near the pages from which the hon. member for York South assembled his list. They are, “void, vacant, hollow, vacuous, blank, devoid, destitute, depleted, desolate”.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would be fortunate enough to have an opportunity to take part in this important debate. I would just like to bring the government back to earth. I would advise the ministers that I, too, have had an opportunity to talk to our manufacturers, particularly in the city of Hamilton. If they think these manufacturers show a great deal of confidence in the government's fiscal and monetary policies, they are absolutely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give you some indication of what these manufacturers have been telling me, what makes them so concerned and so worried about the policies of the government, policies which are strangling our secondary industries to such a point that right at this particular time they do not have a great deal of faith in what is occurring in terms of this country's progress, economically speaking, particularly with reference to the near future. I just want to mention five or six items about which manufacturers are very concerned. One is

the freeing of the Canadian dollar, which has certainly affected our exports. Then there is the dumping of goods on the Canadian market and other actions by foreign countries. There are the increased costs of government in Canada, and the high corporate taxation rate, vis-à-vis Japan, of 26 per cent.

Manufacturers are concerned about research and development policy in Canada having an impetus toward government and universities and not toward industry. They are concerned about non-tariff barriers to exports. Let me explain what that means. I refer to an article in the *Hamilton Spectator* of January 16, written by James Carr, business editor, which leaves no room for doubts. In it he says:

The problem today is not tariff barriers but non-tariff barriers—a much more subtle form of trade discrimination designed to keep certain Canadian products from competing in other countries.

This is a familiar problem in the electrical industry, which is also being pushed hard by imports. Yet when a Canadian company tries to bid on electrical equipment in countries like Japan, West Germany, France and Britain, the bid is ignored in favour of a domestic manufacturer—even though the bid may be substantially lower.

● (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Carr continues:

The big job creators are our manufacturing industries and until their products are given an equal chance at home and abroad, Canada will always have an unemployment problem.

Do I need to read any more? I now wish to talk about another area. I found out, as a result of participating in the work of the special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons which travelled west, that there is a considerable amount of alienation in western Canada. This has been epitomized by an editorial in the *Edmonton Journal* of January 15, 1971, known as “Comment”. The headings is, “Lumping it”. I quote from the editorial as follows:

When May unemployment figures showed 513,000 people still without jobs, Mr. Trudeau was even more emphatic about the policy which was fighting inflation at the expense of jobs and growth.

The article then quotes what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said on television as follows:

‘If the Canadian people don't like it, you know they can lump it,’ he said on television.

The editorial continues:

The time to have done something about this winter's unemployment was last summer, when Mr. Trudeau was telling Canadians that he wouldn't change his policies and they could like it or lump it.

We're lumping it now. And the worst thing about it is not the misery, heartbreak and human tragedy of this winter's unemployment. It is the fact that the government shows no awareness that there has been anything wrong with its economic record or that better, more effective, and less brutal policies are needed in the future.

This afternoon I listened to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and to my friend the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault).

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]