

Interim Supply

is that when we caught sight of it, it appeared to be back where it had been previously. The Prime Minister asserts that production has moved to higher levels than ever before. This may be so. However, he has neglected to point out that production per capita has declined over the last year. It is not really good enough for the Prime Minister to tell the people that production in Canada has increased beyond the expectations of the hon. member for Davenport. What we are concerned about is not just production; we are concerned about providing useful work for men and women. This government ought to have its eye upon that social objective. What we are trying to do is achieve full employment, not simply to achieve greater and greater levels of production.

When we in this corner talk about full employment I think we owe it to the house to make clear what we are thinking about. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke during the throne speech debate he said that during the term of office of the regime of which he was a member, unemployment was 3 per cent from 1946 to 1957. He neglected to point out that from 1954 to 1956 unemployment was 4.1 per cent and was getting worse all the time. But you cannot measure full employment with these barren statistics. You can only achieve a policy of full employment when there are more vacant jobs than there are people without jobs. That is what we in this parliament should be trying to achieve, and what the government should be trying to achieve. You cannot simply measure unemployment statistically. You have to get rid of the notion that we can have tolerable levels of unemployment.

The hon. member for Davenport in his well known report to the late Liberal government talked about a tolerable level of unemployment of 3 per cent or 4 per cent, but we say this is entirely the wrong way to look at the situation. What we ought to be trying to establish is a situation where if there is anyone out of work, be it 1 per cent or 2 per cent or 3 per cent of the labour force, there are no people who are chronically unemployed as so many thousands were during the old Liberal regime and as so many thousands have been during the present regime. What we want to achieve is a situation where anyone out of work knows and lives secure in the knowledge that he can move to another job when he wishes, or that his old job will certainly be available to him before long.

I think this is the objective that all parties in the house should be seeking. We in this corner of the house have said that this objective can be accomplished through so-

cial and economic planning. The government so far have indicated that they are unwilling to grasp this concept. They have promised us a national economic development board. We are looking forward to the introduction of the legislation to establish that board, and we hope it will be legislation which will adopt in a genuine fashion the whole idea of social and economic planning. If it does so the government can rest assured that it will receive the support of hon. members in this corner of the house.

But we believe that the government should be giving serious consideration to the kind of planning that will bring about full employment in this country. You cannot bring about full employment simply by increasing the supply of money. I know that hon. members opposite in the Social Credit group believe that you can, but you cannot do it in that simple way. True, increasing demand, increasing purchasing power, increasing the supply of money—this is one of the tools by which you can achieve prosperity and full employment, but by itself it will not accomplish a great deal. We could increase transfer payments in this country and we would not achieve full employment, because by putting purchasing power in the hands of our people we do not bring idle labour and idle capacity together. This, of course, is what our friends opposite continually overlook. This is the fundamental fallacy of their approach to the matter.

Mr. Patterson: I am glad you have studied it, anyway.

Mr. Berger: The necessity we must face is the necessity for planning, and you cannot plan if you are simply going to increase the supply of money—

(Translation):

An hon. Member: And the balance, later on?

(Text):

Mr. Berger:—and thereby induce a state of indiscriminate spending; because if you go to the store to buy groceries you do not by doing so put construction workers back to work. This is why we in this corner of the house feel that it is necessary to go very much beyond the rather primitive concept which those who espouse Social Credit theories urge us to accept, because we believe that you have to plan public and private investment in this country.

(Translation):

An hon. Member: How will you go about it?

(Text):

Mr. Berger: The government has the fiscal and monetary tools to regulate public investment in Canada and, as speakers from this corner of the house have already done, I