

*Unemployment Measures Lacking*

They should tell the people that they are unable to settle this problem. Social Credit has the formula to do it, and I am convinced that at the next general election, the electors of the whole country, who are in a position to judge the present attitude of the two older parties, which cannot find a solution to the problem, are going to make a thorough change and try something new. They have nothing to lose, it is true.

It would be worth while to elect a government which would enact legislation for the benefit of man who should be our prime concern. In fact, we must constantly bear in mind the ideal of our constituents; we must think about it 24 hours a day. All members must think of their respective constituents.

One thing that I cannot stand is that in a country as rich as ours—and no one denies that—we have to live as beggars and as paupers of the worst kind.

When one travels throughout Canada, one sees vast expanses of land and forest which remain undeveloped. On the other hand, certain communities have slums as is the case in my riding. Such a situation is intolerable. Our cities could stand a lot of improvement, if it were not for the shortsightedness of our governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fine thing to govern but what must one do in order to govern? One must be provident; that is the first qualification of any government.

Instead of providing work for our carpenters and other workers who have little education, the government has decided to impose an 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. Instead of that, it should have advocated slum removal and provided an 11 per cent reduction on the cost of all building materials to help the building industry.

If the government had acted that way, the economy would have started going again and that would have given temporary work to our unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper *Le Devoir* of October 5, 1963 carried an article on automation. And I ask hon. members to take good note of what is said in it because it is a serious article, one of substance:

Automation would involve the suppression of 40,000 jobs each week in the United States.

Well, they also are affected by automation. Every week, 40,000 more unemployed. What will they have to do to straighten out that situation? And the article goes on:

Protesting against what he called the deliberately blind official optimism—

That, Mr. Speaker, is the stand taken by this government which sees the problem but still believes or at least hopes that it will solve itself in time.

And I continue:

Protesting against what he called the deliberately blind official optimism and the childish myths, Mr. J. I. Snyder, president of a large industrial American firm and considered as one of the main experts of the nation on automation matters, stated on Thursday that automation involves the suppression of some 40,000 jobs each week in the United States.

Before the Senate subcommittee on labour, Mr. Snyder (whose own concern manufactures automated equipment) challenged the allegations of the department of labour that the improvement of the productivity (of which automation is one of the factors) would eliminate some 200,000 jobs every year in the manufacturing industry.

—200,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous figure.

And I continue:

Myths exploded

"I think that would be to dangerously underestimate the real impact of automation on employment development in the United States" said Mr. Snyder who added: "Development of automation involves directly or indirectly the suppression of some 40,000 jobs each week and that means not only 40,000 more unemployed, but much more than that if you take into consideration the workers who, down through the future years, would have occupied those jobs, had they been maintained".

The expert denounced the intellectual laziness and the lack of courage of the public powers and of certain financial quarters who kept alive the myth that "automation will give rise, in other sectors of employment, to opportunities which will largely offset the job cancellations."

There may be a danger that Canada will be facing that same kind of unemployment within a couple of years if we do not make provision against that plague.

Crisis feared

"It is obvious that things do not work out that way. First, the present technological developments involve the creation of only a few new jobs as compared with the number of jobs washed out.

Then, it must be recognized that to rehabilitate workers is far from being so easy and simple as some people have claimed. Finally, workers that have been cast aside by progress are generally, in view of their low degree of education, their temperament, their age, etc., the most difficult to rehabilitate, the least inclined to move to some other town or area."

Mr. Snyder said, in closing: "If we do not want to be up against a terrible unemployment crisis within four or five years, it is important that teams of sociologists and economists be mobilized without delay to prepare drastic solutions to deal with an unprecedented problem.

Mr. Speaker, when I hear statements such as that one, I cannot help but think that, due to unemployment, there are sometimes whole families in extreme poverty just because automation makes it impossible for the head of the family to earn his daily bread and that of his children.