

*Employment Support Bill*

have been quite easy not to bring forward the bill at all. The object of the bill is not to create unemployment, to put people on welfare or on unemployment insurance but, rather, to keep them employed and, I hope, usefully employed. Any accusation to the effect that this is a new kind of unemployment insurance leaves a lot to the imagination and very little to reason.

The hon. member also spoke about a great deal of help to large businesses and none to small businesses. The minister dealt with this matter adequately in the House, indicating quite clearly that there is no minimum—a firm with five or seven or even three employees may make application. The important factor is that a significant number of them are affected and about to be laid off or likely to be laid off as a result of the surcharge. That is the only qualification, so I see no reason for anyone to be concerned about the content of this legislation or the regulations and say it is only for big business. Many of us realize that much of big business, particularly primary industries such as the automobile industry, is not affected by the surcharge, so a host of large corporations in Canada are eliminated from the provisions of this bill.

If I understood the hon. member for Kent-Essex correctly, he indicated that the department should ensure that the contents of this bill are known to all business in the country because many of them do not have the knowledge or perhaps the expertise to take advantage of its provisions. I would suggest that indicates it is good legislation.

I think all hon. members should bear in mind—I am sure most do—that we as individual members have a serious responsibility as representatives of our people. I for one want to make sure, without any action by the department, that every industry in my riding is thoroughly aware of the implications of this legislation and the consequences to them. To that end I have established an industrial seminar in my riding to be held on November 6 to deal not only with this bill but the myriad of bills before us for the purpose of stimulating economic growth and activity across Canada.

**An hon. Member:** Information Canada.

**Mr. Cafik:** I want to make sure that the people in my riding do not suffer in the way that the hon. member for Kent-Essex feels his constituents may suffer, and I personally will do something to make sure they are informed. I consider that to be part of my job.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cafik:** The hon. member for Kent-Essex also said that this bill will not do anything positive to create new markets, etc. But that is not the purpose of the bill. Surely the hon. member is aware that there are many government programs designed for that purpose. The measure of emphasis that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has put on the question he raised is illustrated by the fact that in 1962-63 there were only three programs designed for that purpose; today there are 12 industrial assistance programs. Last year the government had over \$200 million allocated for that kind of purpose, but in 1962-63 only \$35 million was available. I do not think that every act has to do all things for all people. We have acts

[Mr. Cafik.]

to do the things the hon. member has in mind. All we have to do is look at them. If a member has problems in his constituency, he can find out about these programs.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cafik:** There is PAIT, the Program for the Advancement of Industrial Technology, which is very useful. There is the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act, the industrial design assistance program, the program to enhance productivity, and a host of others. They are all designed to do what the hon. member feels ought to be done by this bill. But this bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to make sure that we maintain levels of employment as a result of this temporary surcharge.

**Mr. Benjamin:** How temporary?

**Mr. Cafik:** I do not think it can be expected to do other things. In committee I proposed five amendments to the bill.

**Mr. Benjamin:** What happened to them?

**An hon. Member:** Where are they?

**Mr. Cafik:** They were all passed and accepted by the government.

**An hon. Member:** Who wrote them?

**Mr. Cafik:** I wrote them.

**An hon. Member:** Attaboy!

**Mr. Cafik:** If hon. members opposite would like to put forward reasonable amendments they might be accepted too.

**An hon. Member:** Come on Cafik, be fair.

**Mr. Cafik:** In any event, clauses 12, 13, 15 and 18 were all designed to do away with the term "levels of productivity". Initially the act was designed to maintain levels of employment and productivity, and I proposed that we eliminate the reference to productivity. I did this for a number of reasons. First, I feel that the maintenance of productivity could well be a violation of GATT. If these products would normally go to the United States and now could not because of the surcharge, and yet we maintained production in order to keep a certain level of employment, what would we be doing? Perhaps we would be suggesting to manufacturers that they should produce exactly the same amount of the same goods as before. But what would they do with these goods—export them to the United States? If they could—and they can now—why would they need the act? Because they are too expensive? What happens then? Do we stop buying? Are they needed?

I believe there must be a degree of flexibility so that we do not create a kind of hothouse productivity for its own sake. Firms must be flexible if they wish to maintain employment. They may use the money to seek markets in other parts of the world, or for development and so on. This is an important change and I thank the government for accepting these amendments.

I support this bill, Mr. Speaker. I have one last point to make and that is that I believe it is very useful to maintain