

proposals by this party had been accepted, the Canada Development Corporation could be the vital tool that is needed to assist economic development in Canada and certainly economic development for some of the less favoured regions.

The government must have some plan in mind. I suggest they are going to announce this new plan just before the election. After they have sold out the country and have opted out of the many alternatives open to them, they will come along with a new policy just before the election and, after they have sold out Canada, say they will save this country.

What this legislation before us today does is outline the nakedness of the government's position. It, in effect, gives a blank cheque to the minister. We really do not have any criteria or guidelines set out in the legislation. I understand that the draft regulations may be available to us at some point. I will certainly be very interested in studying them to see how far they go.

It is quite obvious that this legislation was very hastily drawn. It is another patchwork solution, something this government is very adept at doing. I suggest they wanted to show the government was doing something to deal with the situation, but does it really do anything? Is the government really doing anything to help the situation? This is a very debatable question, one which could be argued back and forth.

An interesting statement has been issued by the general manager of the Canadian Electrical Manufacturers Association. In commenting on the government's proposed legislation, he said:

Resulting unemployment is not likely to occur in dramatic lay-offs of hundreds of people in one place at one time. Consequently, government compensation of the kind offered will be difficult to claim and the prospect is not reassuring.

This is only one indicator, but it is worthy of note. It indicates some of the concerns that have been expressed by many of us with regard to this legislation, namely that it will not do what the government claims it will. The fact is there are no basic solutions put forward in this legislation. To some extent, I suppose, the government does indicate that this is an emergency piece of legislation. Emergency legislation is necessary from time to time, as long as it does deal with the immediate situation and open the way to finding longer term solutions. There is also the question: who is really helped by this legislation. I am not at all sure it will have the effect claimed for it by the minister or that in fact the title of the bill, the Employment Support Act, will be justified when it comes to putting this measure into effect.

The minister says this is a first step among other things the government intends to do. I hope the government has other measures in mind. I hope these measures will contain more substance than the legislation now before us, otherwise Canada will be in a pretty bad position. I notice as well that this legislation is directed primarily toward assisting manufacturing industries. All of us have to recognize that many manufacturing industries will be hurt as a result of the new situation and that there is some need for action. It is possible that jobs will be lost and this must be of concern to all of us. I am

Employment Support Bill

sure the minister will do his best to give effect to this legislation so that it will be of benefit to those affected. He is regarded by many people as being a good technician and he will no doubt do his best to make the best of a poor job in terms of the legislation. I note that the minister is very fast to move when it comes to helping industry, and giving hand-outs to industry, but this is not the case when it comes to other sectors of the economy.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Here I must take note of the agriculture industry. This morning during the question period reference was made to some of the problems faced by agriculture. At that time it was stated: well, we are going to have to wait and see. That is not what is being done with industry; the government claims it is taking action now, that it is doing something in the bill before us. So they are doing something. If they say that is their intention, to take action, I do not quarrel with them. But what is their attitude with respect to agriculture and to some of the industries we heard about, for example, the fishing industry? Well, we are going to wait and see, we are going to study the problem, we are going to look at it and it may be we shall figure out what to do.

Surely the government has taken note of its own study and work on the impact of this legislation on Canada, because it has been noted with respect to animal and vegetable products imported by the United States from Canada that some 63.5 per cent of these imports will be subject to the surcharge on the basis of the latest figures for 1970. This is higher than for any other industrial group set out by the federal government in its studies. Certainly there are components of other industrial groups which reflect a higher percentage, but by and large it is the group comprising animal and vegetable products which is most severely hit by the action of the United States government. We also have the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) when he said in debate last Tuesday, as reported on page 7586 of *Hansard*:

I should like to note that because of the nature of agricultural production and trade and because of the trade pattern which has evolved over the years, the impact of these measures taken by the United States on our agriculture industry could be particularly severe.

Later, the minister said that the application of the surcharge weighs particularly heavily on agriculture. So the minister himself has noted the effects of the surcharge upon agriculture. But what is the government going to do? It is going to wait and see. Certainly, it is obvious that they may help some producers, some secondary industry which processes agricultural products, through the bill now before us. How much this helps agricultural producers is a question which could be studied further. The Minister of Agriculture said the other day that they were going to give agricultural problems arising out of the new situation a commodity by commodity review. He also said they were going to use the Agriculture Stabilization Act. In the first place, I might note that there are a few exemptions from the Agricultural Stabilization Act which are of interest to some of us in western Canada in particular. I am sure the Minister of Trade