

Canada needs if we want to work seriously toward solving our economic problems and setting up a just society for everybody, big and small.

As for me, I prefer by far Major Douglas's philosophy to Carl Marx's economic philosophy because I believe in the first one, I believe in its possible application and I believe it is likely to make Canadians a happy people able to live from the exploitation of our natural resources.

On the other hand, I know that to apply the economic principles of Social Credit would require a lot of courage from the government since it would necessarily have to leave the beaten path so as to put into operation a mechanism which would permit distributing the huge production of modern inventions, of science and of research carried out through generations. The consequence of this research has been to increasingly eliminate purely man-made work in view of producing the huge volume of manufactured facilities required to meet humanity's needs.

Indeed the decision to act will have to be taken some day, for the situation is becoming increasingly serious. The number of graduate workers and others is getting larger from year to year without them being able to find work on the labour market.

That is why the government should seriously consider the suggestions we are making very objectively in order to help it cope with the problems facing us at this time.

That discount policy would not be new altogether, since it has been in operation during the 1939-45 war for reasons obviously different from those of today, but which were nevertheless valid and which warranted the establishment of such a policy on the part of the government.

We already have had that during the war, with good results. Why should the same measure not bring about the same results in peace time?

The government is sometimes inclined to tell the opposition that we criticize a lot and that we seldom come up with suggestions for practical solutions. The government does not listen attentively to our suggestions and it keeps on believing that we do not put forward any constructive suggestions.

On the other hand, I realize that it is not completely free in several cases, for it is influenced by big business whose interests are not always compatible with the best interests of the population.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce warned us in his speech yesterday that the administration of Bill C-262 might prove extremely difficult and that he is not too sure about the results.

Why then did he say that when we make suggestions the government demands guaranteed results while when the government launches a policy, it is okay to give it a whirl? It can be put to the test even though the results are not guaranteed.

I am convinced that this policy will be hard to implement because no new measures can actually be applied

### *Employment Support Bill*

without causing some difficulties here and there. What is important in all this, is to aim with accuracy. I, for one, know that if this bill is adopted and applied with all the tools and instruments provided to the government, then it would allow the government to pursue its policy of industrial centralization, and that, to the detriment of rural communities where small industries have been set up and where they have rendered invaluable services to the people.

I warn the government: if they attempt to acquire one more tool to centralize industries in three, four or five large centres in each province, I shall oppose them in every possible way for I feel, I am convinced, that this would be contrary to the real interests of rural communities and small urban centres.

● (5:10 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, there are times in the life of a nation when an issue or an economic situation clearly transcends party differences; when a situation arises which demands of all of us an approach which de-emphasizes mere argumentation and emphasizes public good and need. This, without any doubt at all, is such an occasion.

The action taken by the United States may have a profound effect on the economies of every single nation in this world and may certainly shape our economic decisions for tomorrow. I think all of us were encouraged a few days ago when the government announced its intention to act swiftly and decisively to provide assistance to the workers of Canada.

We were gratified with the response of the leaders of Her Majesty's opposition parties when they stated they wanted to expedite the consideration of any emergency measures. That is the kind of action which encourages public support for Parliament. It has been heartening to hear the useful comments which have been made by some opposition speakers. It has been equally disheartening to note the attempts by a minority of opposition members to exploit the nation's current economic problem, and it is the nation's problem, not the problem of the government, the Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Social Credit parties. It is everyone's problem and if we are frank we will admit it. It is not the problem of the government alone. It is a problem of every party and the people without party. It is difficult to believe, for example, speaking of one of those minority voices—that loud and strident voice from Calgary North—that any spokesman for the official opposition would have the courage to suggest that this government has failed to promote Canadian-American unity. This is incredible.

In 1957 that party advanced the view that we should reduce U.S. dependency. One of the main clarion calls of his party was that we should transfer 25 per cent of our trade, as one of the first steps of a new Conservative government, to the United Kingdom. We all remember those days of oratory in 1957. Not only did that government not effect such a trade transfer to the United Kingdom of 25 per cent—