Supply-Finance

assert its rights in this regard, as it had to the important question that is of so much do on another occasion many long years ago with respect to the activities of another western government.

I know the government is most concerned about its deficit. I am sure the Minister of Finance is not happy at having to record his fourth or fifth consecutive deficit. The forecasts he has made have been so wrong. The newspaper world is encouraged to report a 3 per cent increase, I believe it is, in our gross national product. I should like to analyse that report and to see what it means in terms of our dollar today and of our per capita production, because the minister is aware of the fact that there has been a decline in the per capita production of goods and services ever since this government took office. Percentagewise the decline has been considerable. I believe the minister also knows that our economy needs a 6 per cent per capita per annum growth in order to supply the employment opportunities that the country needs.

I would suggest to the government that this is its responsibility, if it wants to balance the budget and bail out the minister before he gets appointed to some other place. The way to do it is to get the economy going again, and to get it rolling at least to the extent of a 6 per cent increase per capita per annum in real wealth. If the government will take measures that will enhance and boost the economy to that extent I shall have no quarrel to find with a deficit if it is designed to fulfil that purpose. But the deficit was designed only to patch up the immediate situation; it was not designed to give our economy the boost that it needs. If the government is going to give our economy that boost, then the day is not far distant when the minister will no longer have to report a deficit; he will be able to report a surplus instead. You cannot report a surplus when you have a million people unemployed.

I hope the government is going to do much more in the months immediately ahead than it has done in the past to get Canada on to a rolling start. Among other things there is need to associate ourselves with the economies of western Europe and of the United Kingdom. If we intend to bury our heads in the sand and think that we can continually live off the little bit of the spillover of prosperity that may come to us across the 49th parallel we will be hurting not only our own Canadian welfare but we will be also very seriously damaging the cause of western unity and of world peace.

Mr. Hees: When I rose before the dinner recess, Mr. Chairman, as you know, I asked permission to have a table inserted in Hansard which I thought would be useful to hon. members and would enable them to study ment now on that suggestion. The countries

interest to the committee, namely the possible entry of Great Britain into the common market. That permission was denied by the opposition. That, of course, is understandable because they do not want to be confused by knowledge or facts; they would far sooner go on approaching these matters from the point of view of ignorance and not know the facts about the matter they are discussing. However, as I said, I have arranged to have that table distributed to hon. members. I know members of the opposition will not look at it because they do not want to be informed, but I know that the Conservative members of parliament, who are good members of parliament, who want to be advised about important matters of the day, will study it with great interest. They will see it shows the effect which the United Kingdom acceptance of the European common market tariff could have on our trade with the United Kingdom market. After studying it, I feel that hon, members will understand why I took such pains at Accra to point out to the United Kingdom government the importance to Canada of maintaining our present trading arrangements in that market.

We are convinced that when another government is contemplating action which we believe could seriously affect the welfare of Canadians, it is our duty to bring that matter to the attention of the other government well in advance of the contemplated action being taken, and this we have done. The official opposition objects to our having done this. as shown by the words of the Leader of the Opposition when he said in this house on Friday, September 15, as recorded at page 8407 of Hansard:

May I ask the Prime Minister a question arising out of what he has just said. In view of what he has said, will the right hon. gentleman instruct the ministers concerned to stop their public squealing before Canada is hurt.

I can quite understand the Leader of the Opposition saying this, Mr. Chairman, as the government of which he was a member never did have the courage to speak up to another government about matters concerning the welfare of Canadians until after action had been taken, and it was then too late to do anything about it. The former government would then squeal piteously, but, of course, it was too late.

The leader of the C.C.F. party took a different and much more objective view of this whole matter when he commented on it last Tuesday. He suggested, if I interpret his remarks correctly, that Canada should make application to join the European common market, and I should like to com-