

that we shall certainly not cure by hiding our head in the sand like an ostrich.

I think that the government is aware of this to some extent, because for the last few years, it has been fond of so-called social measures. But they are being implemented too fearfully and faintheartedly perhaps, because the government might be a little too afraid to upset our long-standing financial theories, to give rise to conflict with other countries with which we have financial relations.

I am seriously wondering whether the government would not be well advised to look into the theory advocated by our friends of the New Democratic Party, taking into account, of course, certain priorities. There should be no question, for instance, of nationalizing all Canadian industries, but rather of making possible perhaps a certain competition between state and private intervention and in fields where private enterprise is unable to meet the essential requirements of every member in all segments of the great Canadian family.

Mention was made a while ago of that type of insurance organization that drains money from the Canadian economy and then distributes it, not always equitably, and not always in the public interest.

I will give you an example. Restrictions have been put on the construction of small homes for the small wage-earner, because there is no money for him. In the meantime, in large Canadian cities, huge "people boxes" so-called "apartment blocks" are going up which are not half rented, sometimes not a third rented; they do not necessarily correspond to a need but, in some cases, help to evacuate buildings that are not always fit dwellings. Hundreds of millions of dollars are thus secured which could otherwise be channelled toward a priority need, dwellings for the small wage-earner with a family. The government could perhaps step into that sector of the nation's economy, take control of it, and certain other spheres, and straighten things out.

I revert to something I said a while ago. I am of those who shied away from some words for a while; I saw in them consequences of a local nature perhaps. I may have feared that nationalization in certain fields might lead to political influence which in some cases might have degenerated into persecution of political foes, into unwarranted pressures in fields where the government should not interfere. This led me to be very

#### *Tight Money Policy*

reticent about the idea of nationalization in certain fields. But, I must say, due to circumstances, Canadian public opinion has evolved in this respect. Moreover, such abuse as was known in the past, repetition of which might have been feared, can no longer occur in view of the general mentality.

I was impressed especially to see that one of the spokesmen of our Quebec clergy which, for a long time, had the reputation of being somewhat conservative—in the economic sense, not the political one—is today in the van of this theory, and accepts even readily that consideration be given to this trend toward socialization which will ensure a better distribution of the nation's resources to provide more efficiently for the essential needs of all our citizens.

Even if those ideas come from an opposition party, even though they are advocated with a certain tartness of speech and sometimes accompanied by votes of censure which are not very kind and not always justified, I believe the Liberal party, which is in office, should be a party which has an ideology like the N.D.P. whose members are Liberals in a hurry, and should quicken the step because the needs of the Canadian people are perhaps more pressing than ever and people are less prepared to be patient than they were in the past. In the face of this explosion in nearly all fields, the people call for these basic things to which they are entitled—lodging, food, medical care, education, their place in the sun—and reject this idea of a privileged class, which, because of an established and long-standing system, lives in luxury while others have to deprive themselves.

Therefore, I repeat that I do not know yet if I shall vote for the non-confidence motion. I should like to hear additional speakers put forward arguments for or against the motion, and I hope they will do so in the same constructive spirit shown by those who took part in the discussion up to now. However, I should like to suggest, as dispassionately as I can, that social legislation should be emphasized and stepped up—there are a few measures on the program—so as to provide all Canadians with basic medical care, necessary medicines, pensions for older people geared to the cost of living, funds necessary to young Canadians to acquire a proper education, in short what a family man needs to decently raise his family. Our government should be bold enough to consider measures it never envisaged before. The government should