

*Unemployment*

**Mr. Knowles:** The government will be reading MacTavish out of the party.

**Mr. Martin:** Don't interrupt.

**Mr. Argue:** The minister continued:

—a tendency during 1954 for businesses to meet orders from inventories rather than new production;—

In other words, to use surpluses in hand instead of producing more. That is what I take that sentence to mean. The minister went on:

—and, finally, intensification of international competition in manufactured goods which presented new difficulties to some manufacturing industries, in foreign and also in domestic markets.

This government loves competition, and as soon as their free enterprise friends find a little international competition, what is the result? Unemployment at home and a statement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce listing all of the reasons for this dreadful situation in 1954. How does the minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) summarize somewhat later that very realistic statement that he himself has made? Listen to this; a real gem—two pages later, 1633, same speech, same minister—

**Mr. Knowles:** Same time, same station.

**An hon. Member:** Dagnet.

**Mr. Argue:** The minister said:

I do not want to claim that the economic policies which were followed were solely or mainly responsible for the reasonably good showing in 1954.

In one breath he tells us we are in a terrible position and he says next that it was a reasonably good showing. Half a million unemployed and the Minister of Trade and Commerce says it is a reasonably good showing. That was his contribution to the debate. He said nothing at all as to government policies. He gave us a review of past history while the situation grew steadily worse.

Then I shall have to again paraphrase this statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent). He said in his Reform Club speech, "If my government cannot solve the unemployment problem, then the public of Canada should turn us out of office as being incompetent". That is cold comfort to the unemployed. The people of Canada will have to wait until there is another election in order to do something about it. That is not good enough. This government has accepted the responsibility of office given to them in a democratic manner by the Canadian public and given to them on a platform of full employment and jobs for all. The Liberal party has electioneered on the same platform in 1945, 1949 and 1953; full employment.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) shakes his head in the negative. That is a fine attitude for the minister to take.

**Mr. Martin:** Will my hon. friend permit a question?

**Mr. Argue:** No, I shall not permit the minister a question.

**Mr. Martin:** Then you do not believe in the democratic procedure of free speech.

**Mr. Argue:** Well now, I would ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare to resume his seat.

**Mr. Martin:** Will my hon. friend permit a question?

**Mr. Argue:** The answer is no. When I outlined the statement made by the Liberal party election after election, a belief in full employment and a campaign program of jobs for all, the Minister of National Health and Welfare shook his head in the negative. Well he might shake his head in the negative; well he might.

**Mr. Martin:** You are afraid to let me put a question to you.

**Mr. Argue:** When the former minister of finance, Mr. Abbott, and the same Prime Minister said that the government did not agree to implement its policy of full employment even if all of the provinces agreed to sign the dominion-provincial tax agreements, still we believed that the federal government's attitude toward full employment as outlined in its proposals in 1945 still held good until January 17 when the Prime Minister rose in this house and told us in no uncertain terms that the government had completely abandoned those concepts of full employment that would be brought about by the dominion-provincial agreements—

**Mr. Martin:** You are wrong again. You are misquoting the Prime Minister apparently deliberately. Apparently you are misquoting him deliberately.

**Mr. Argue:** I would ask whether such a remark is parliamentary—

**Mr. Martin:** You read his remarks and see how far off you are.

**Mr. Argue:** If it is in the rules of the house, all well and good; but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the Minister of National Health and Welfare that I was deliberately misquoting the Prime Minister should be withdrawn.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not impute any motive to my hon. friend, notwithstanding the fact that he would not