

the situation with respect to the 40-year old people who lose their jobs and are not always able to find new ones.

They are human beings who deserve to live and society should look after them right now.

● (4:50 p.m.)

Would you advise this man to apply for social assistance? Is he going to ask the senator? As far as I am concerned, I would hesitate to do it since the man is only forty and is still in good health. He is still able to serve his country. Should we advise the unemployed to request that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) give them retraining courses, or tell them to hope and wish that unemployment benefits can eventually be paid to them? Or that the government may ultimately become their boss and advise them to tighten their belts so the nightmare could disappear? Or should we tell them to be proud of the sacrifice they are making in the national interest, that they are true patriots, people whose self sacrifice helps others to find jobs and who tighten their belts and watch others work.

We should not allow the level of unemployment to increase.

Senator Croll has said.

There is uneasiness in the country and unemployment would not resolve it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to quote another liberal member because the government has been informed not only by opposition but also by cabinet members who took their role seriously and have moved in time. I am referring to the member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer), a former minister who left the present government because of its economic policy which is spreading poverty rather than prosperity.

This member, who is no longer a minister, was openly blaming the government for its economic policy. The member for Trinity in a debate in the House maintained that technically and financially, the government policy was an almost complete disaster and, morally, a complete failure.

Besides, the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) who is seating with the cabinet members is not always congratulated by his colleagues. It is nevertheless he who has publicly declared that the government's current economic policy will create a barbarian and ferocious society. These are grave words. These statements were not made by us but by members elected under the Liberal banner in 1968, who are now disappointed with the economic policy of the government.

Later on, another member of the cabinet of the Prime Minister also resigned—and not the least, for he is an economist—because the government's social and economic policy is not aimed towards the achievement of a just society in Canada: I am speaking of the former Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans).

The Minister of Trade, Commerce and Industry stated that the American surcharge would harm Canada, but that it would have done so even more if he and his colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) had not gone to the United States to explain to the Americans all

### *Employment Support Bill*

the harm that surcharge will cause Canada. Well, I never!

I am convinced the Americans listened attentively to the Canadian ministers—of course! they are polite people—but they knew beforehand the effects of that policy; why else would they have adopted it? Of course, they adopted it to protect themselves. Even if we went to them and said that we are hurt they would not remove it today or tomorrow. If all the countries which export to the U.S. made representations similar to ours, do you think that they would change the American policy? I do not think so.

Answering questions put to him by the members of the parliamentary committee, in the United States, the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers stated:

The 10 per cent surcharge on imports will not remain forever. However, I would not hazard a guess as to the period of time it will remain in effect.

Hon. members know that newspapers indicated it might last only 90 days, but everybody knows that temporary measures sometimes become permanent and governments say that they are only temporary to assure slow acceptance by the population.

As an example, one must remember our own temporary taxes which have unfortunately become permanent in many cases. The main purpose of the American surcharge is to protect American industries and American workers as well. Under the present circumstances, Canada must adopt measures designed to promote the consumption of Canadian products, by ordering a discount on Canadian production affected by the American surcharge and on other new products.

I for one believe that this situation will linger on and that a good many industries will of necessity have to remodel their plants in order to manufacture other items, and under such circumstances, I would suggest to the government to apply the discount policy to those new products.

Therefore, we must adopt a policy likely to stimulate the consumption of Canadian products and this to increase productivity and create jobs in Canada.

A member said a moment ago that \$80 million was a very small amount to solve the problem. I entirely agree with him, because we feel, considering the large number of manufacturers exporting to the United States that it does not take long to squeeze \$80 million out of the people and that this amount will not be sufficient to replace the purchasing power which will cross over to the United States without the Canadian industries getting any benefit therefrom.

This is why I suggest that instead of subsidizing the industries, we should subsidize consumption. We would thus automatically protect not only the industry, but also the worker and trade which must rely on the marketing of our domestic goods.

One might tell me perhaps that the 10 per cent tax will not affect all Canadian products. In fact, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) was saying yesterday night while taking part in the debate on the bill now before us, this measure would not apply to all agricultural products.