

Interim Supply

Mr. Aiken: Then I would ask a second question.

Mr. Carter: Can an hon. member not describe a problem to a department without involving criticism of the minister? It is not a criticism at all. I think they are doing the best they can and I agree with their objective, but I am trying to show that in spite of their good intentions it is working a hardship on the fishermen and that some other method should be used rather than the one being employed at the present time.

The salmon school in many parts of Newfoundland at its peak lasts only for about 14 days, and if the fishermen have to lose four or five days because they have tied up their nets for the week end and in addition have to lose other days because of stormy weather and also have to take in their nets for repairs or cleaning, then it adds up to half of their fishing season being lost. This constitutes a very grave and serious problem to the fishermen in my riding, and in particular to those fishermen of Hermitage bay, which suffer more than other parts of Newfoundland from these regulations because, although there they are inside the five mile limit, their nets are set in what is called rough water. The nets in this particular area are not protecting very many salmon rivers. There are far more salmon rivers in other areas where the fishermen are permitted to set their nets and fish over the week end.

Therefore, I would ask the minister and the government to try and find some other method of dealing with this problem of conservation and to rescind this particular regulation or apply it in some way which would be fair to all and would not result in disadvantages of the sort our fishermen are now experiencing.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put I should like to have a question answered by the minister. The charge was made in this house that the document that I have in my hand, which happens to be the report of the governor of the Bank of Canada and is the property of this house, is a squandering of the people's money. This is the first opportunity the Minister of Finance has had to answer this charge. Would he now care to offer any comment on the charge which has been made?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Robichaud: Therefore, since the minister has no comment to make, he agrees with the charge that has been made.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

[Mr. Carter.]

Mr. Hellyer: I think the government has considerable gall in asking for interim supply at this time. I say this because they are asking for supply to carry on the administration of government without at the same time bringing forward policies to deal with the serious problems which face the Canadian people at the present time.

One of the gravest of these, and one which has been discussed at some length this afternoon, is the matter of unemployment. I do not believe any thinking Canadian could fail to be disturbed by the situation which exists in Canada in March, 1960. The figures which were announced a short time ago are alarming. They show a total of 550,000 people unemployed. That total, moreover, is the figure supplied by the dominion bureau of statistics and it is the least of the three figures published. It has been pointed out this afternoon that this means we have the highest percentage of unemployment of any comparable country in the western world with one in 12, at least, of our working force unemployed. This is something which cannot rest lightly on our consciences. Something must be done about it and for that reason we are dismayed that the government should come to the house and ask for interim supply to carry on its administration without at the same time bringing forward policies to deal with the present situation.

If the unemployed were concentrated in one place, it would mean that in a city the size of Montreal or Toronto, every man and woman who is presently gainfully employed there would be without employment. If the percentage of the labour force in these cities compared with the population is the same as the relation of the labour force of the country to the population of the country as a whole, then approximately 500,000 persons are gainfully employed in each of the two great Canadian cities I have mentioned, the largest in Canada with regard to population. Imagine a city the size of Montreal or Toronto without one single man or woman, self-employed or employee, with any gainful work of any kind whatsoever. How can the government refuse to deal with a situation as grave as this? How can the Minister of Finance sit there and try, if he can, to choke off debate when he knows that more than 500,000 Canadians are this very night wishing that they had some work to go to in the morning?

What does the government propose to do about it? In effect, nothing. My hon. friend from Bonavista-Twillington has said that the Prime Minister told the Canadian people on television: What we did last time was to enter into an era of deficit financing. Then he added that if the same conditions arose