

*National Economic Development Board*

the throne, but in respect of which it hardly showed itself really willing to make any rapid progress—no more than for the other bills.

It is, indeed, the responsibility of the government to arrange legislation to be submitted to the house in such order that the more important bills are considered first.

As I read in *Le Devoir* last December, in an item signed Fernand Bourret:

The government is chiefly responsible. It is up to the government to take action with regard to legislation. If no important legislation has as yet been submitted to the House of Commons, such as would, in time, remedy the economic and financial plight in which Canada finds itself, the fault does not lie with the opposition parties.

Now that we have been sitting for almost four months, this revolutionary formula which, according to the government, will bring about the recovery of our economy is at last submitted to the house.

In the remarks he made when the resolution preceding the bill was introduced, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Nowlan) made some disconcerting statements, several of which are even an admission of the government's inability. He stated, among other things, as may be seen on page 2073 of *Hansard*:

The government is determined to stimulate the further expansion of our existing industries and to encourage even further the development in Canada of new and efficient industries.

And I repeat, he actually said:

The government is determined—

It is easy to conclude that the Minister of Finance is fully aware that up to now the government has not done much in that field.

When the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Dinsdale) said this afternoon, at the beginning of his remarks, that the purpose of the bill now before the house was to continue implementing the government's policy formulated since 1957, I was wondering whether he had not dashed the hopes of the house and of all those who will read his remarks, because should the future be as black as the past years have been I do not know where the voters will be able to see any hope of seeing better day. May I quote the Minister of Finance who said in his speech:

We shall attain that goal—

that is, the expansion of our economy—

—by farsighted measures such as the one introduced by my colleague the Minister of Labour in undertaking research into the impact of automation and technological change.

The thing is clear: the minister had in mind a farsighted program of research. At the [Mr. Legare.]

present time Canadians must bow to the austerity program, but in a few years, after the national economic development board has been in operation for some time we might perhaps nurture the hope that the situation will improve.

The statement of the Minister of Finance contradicts the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) who said in Ottawa, during the week end convention, that the next five years will be crucial for our economy. He was alluding to the bill now before us.

And now, the Minister of Finance tells us that this is a measure which will have long term effects, that is to say in several years.

On the other hand, we were told by the Prime Minister that the effect of the same measure will be to create jobs for a million persons and that it will improve the economy in the near future.

This is the most obvious contradiction as between two cabinet members I have ever heard.

But the statement by the Minister of Finance which astonished me most is the following:

With the present set up of the house, we must show a new national conscience.

This means that, with the results of the last election, we must change our positions, listen more carefully to the official opposition, and accept the suggestions it put forward two or three years ago, that is to set up the board provided for in the bill now before us.

The Minister of Finance brought his remarks to a close with these words:

We are not at all dissatisfied with the progress we are making.

He did not say: "We are satisfied, we are pleased, we have made some progress." He said:

"We are not at all dissatisfied."

I have to admit I have never heard anything so negative as this sentence:

"We are not at all dissatisfied."

I would be tempted to ask the Minister of Finance:—

**Mr. Caouette:** He is not here.

**Mr. Legare:** An hon. member says that the minister is not here. I know that the minister has had to attend some important business elsewhere and that is why he is not in the house right now.

**Mr. Caouette:** Is he gone to Rimouski county?

**Mr. Legare:** He says that he is not at all dissatisfied. I know that there are doubts in the