

*Employment Support Bill*

be spent, how many people will be affected and what is the level of employment, which in effect was the purpose of the amendment which the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) proposed last night. I think we must look at the situation and find out whether we can in fact trust the international firms to play it straight about the level of employment and play it straight with Canadian dollars. Unless the decisions are made in Canada, how can we expect outside industry to play it straight with Canadian tax dollars?

• (9:30 p.m.)

I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) is still in the chamber. It is unfortunate that provision is not made to have on the employment support board representatives of employee groups in Canada. If we are concerned about the methods of reorganizing workers in particular fields, then workers should have their representatives on the board. In some countries employees are represented on various boards where decisions are made which affect their livelihood and employment generally.

I wish to quote a statement made by the vice-chairman of the Science Council of Canada, published in the *Ottawa Citizen* of September 10, 1971. The newspaper report reads:

Lack of government incentives is responsible for the retarded growth of the manufacturing industry in Canada, the vice-chairman of the Science Council of Canada says.

"Nothing has been done to make secondary industry healthy, and more and more multinational corporations are exploiting the Canadian market," Dr. Roger Gaudry told 40 senior industrial and government executives attending a development seminar at Queen's University.

Unemployment would accelerate and industrial research suffer if the situation wasn't altered.

It may be fine to suggest that we can put \$80 million into supporting certain sections of the economy at this time, but apparently we cannot put \$80 million into other areas of the economy where immediate employment could be created. Here I am talking about housing and sewage plant construction, which could provide immediate employment with beneficial results filtering all down the line.

Some hon. members opposite wondered how we could propose an amendment to include farmers and fishermen under the provisions of this bill. It seems strange that these two important areas of the economy, farming and fishing, have been completely omitted from the bill's provisions. I do not know why hon. members opposite cannot agree to extend the protection of the bill to farmers and fishermen. It seems the bill is not intended to help those areas of the economy which have suffered most during the last few years of Liberal government. Surely consideration should be given to these areas of our economy.

If we are concerned, we had better consider who controls the destiny of Canada. If we are concerned about whether Canada can survive, why don't we take action immediately? Why do we have to wait for the government to bring down a white paper on foreign ownership? The government promised it would indicate what it intended to do to protect Canadian ownership of industry and would tell us what it would try to do to buy back ownership of certain industries. But nothing is being done. Now

[Mr. Skoberg.]

we are presented with this stopgap measure to pay \$80 million in order to protect employment. Surely hon. members should be concerned about the destiny of Canada and should realize that if we do not act immediately, Canada will not survive.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, upon learning that the U.S. government had decided to impose a 10 per cent surcharge on imports of manufactured products, the Canadian government was faced with serious problems. It was confronted by a huge problem for small men and the solution as proposed by this government reminds me of Albert Camus' philosophical works which said that Sisyphus had been doomed forever by the Gods to roll uphill a stone which always rolled down again.

The solution put forward by this government is the same it offered in the past to solve other problems. The problems are different, but the same solutions are suggested. The same burden is dragged along and the Liberal government seems eternally condemned to do so by the gods.

Mr. Speaker, the solution which the government wants to impose will have the same effects as all other steps it has taken in the past in an attempt to solve the employment problem in Canada.

The government feels that we must prevent the American surcharge from creating more unemployment in Canada. Such is its objective. We must prevent that by all possible means. However, the government has only found one: To grant to the industries—which in many cases are branches of American companies operating in Canada—grants to enable them to subsidize American consumption. In other words, the United States are thus put on the same footing as underdeveloped countries. I agree with subsidies to help the Arab refugees in Palestine or the Pakistani refugees. But granting subsidies out of the Canadian taxpayers' money to help the American consumers is an outrage: we cannot go along with that.

That is exactly why—

**Mr. La Salle:** That is not true—

**Mr. Laprise:** The member for Joliette says it is not true, but that is exactly what is going to happen—

• (9:40 p.m.)

I have here to prove it an article published in *La Presse* on Wednesday September 8, 1971, and I quote:

—these are obviously grants to export. But such practices have been denounced by the General Assembly of GATT as "non-tariff barriers".

In other words, this rescue plan is no more no less than a retaliatory measure directed against the United States, designed to counteract the effect of the American surcharge in Canada.

The procedure is, all in all, rather simple: in the case of a Canadian product with a listed price of \$100 in the United States, the surcharge would raise this price to \$110. But through the federal government, if a Canadian exporter feels that his sales are jeopardized by this price increase, he may get from Ottawa a compensation for two thirds of this increase, that is \$6.66, which would allow him to reduce his selling price to \$103.33.

This is to enable businessmen to sell at a cheaper price in the United States. We thus come to the conclusion that the \$80 million will be used to subsidize Americans so that