

Interim Supply

they have only 2 per cent of the working force out of work. I quote:

Even during the height of the largest post-war trade recession, when unemployment in other countries went up to 10 per cent and more, unemployment in Great Britain never passed 2.8 per cent.

I wish the Minister of Finance were able to make that kind of boast instead of our having to refer to the fact that unemployment, on the basis of the lowest figure, is between 8 and 9 per cent.

I ask hon. gentlemen to listen to what the Conservatives in Britain say, and it is to be contrasted with what the Conservatives in Canada cannot say:

Conservatives have always believed, however, that apart from maintaining a high general level of employment in the country as a whole the government has a special responsibility to combat unemployment in particular areas where unemployment persistently remains above the national average.

As the Minister of Labour knows, we have particular areas of surplus workers. We have areas where this has been continuing for some time, as the Leader of the Opposition said. In Great Britain they dealt with it by a series of what they called areas acts. There were the areas acts of 1934, 1936, 1937, and the main act in force today is known as the distribution of industry act, 1945.

What has this government done? It brought forth its winter works program, and now they are going to show how interested they are in trying to curb unemployment by extending this anaemic and weak program for another month.

Let us look further at page 31 of this interesting booklet put out by the Conservative party in the United Kingdom. I am surprised that the Minister of Finance, who usually follows all these agencies of political propaganda, has not seen this document that is coloured, as he can see, in light blue and white. The booklet goes on to say, and I ask hon. gentlemen to listen to this:

When it was clear in the early months of 1958 that the world recession of that year might well have a special impact on these areas of high and persistent local unemployment, the government promptly introduced the distribution of industry (industrial finance) act, 1958. This act—

I ask the Minister of Finance to note what it says.

—enables the government quickly to give financial assistance anywhere—

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Does my hon. friend not want to hear good Tory doctrine?

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): Mr. Chairman, the committee has been very patient with the hon. gentleman, I think, feeling that sometimes it is better to let him get these things off

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

his chest because he may feel better afterwards. But the fact is that, even with all the generosity extended to him and the opportunity to range widely even at the expense of the rules of the house, the matter which is now under discussion is whether there should be a reduction by the sum of \$10,000 of a sum of money which the committee is being asked to approve. What is being done in Great Britain, in my respectful submission, has absolutely nothing to do with this question as to the \$10,000. It may interest the hon. gentleman to go into questions applying to the economy of the United Kingdom, but with great respect I say that that has nothing, even by the greatest stretch of the imagination, to do with the question of the \$10,000 under discussion.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the motion before the committee is to reduce the vote by \$10,000, a traditional parliamentary device to give opposition members or any other hon. member a chance to indicate their lack of confidence in the policy of the government. That is why this motion was put forward. In doing that, my hon. friend, the member for Essex East, surely has the right to contrast what has been done in other countries with what has not been done in this country in this particular field so as to give an indication of what the government could do if it so desired. Surely, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister of Finance to try to tell us now that we cannot talk about these things even under this motion because it only mentions \$10,000 is the very ultimate in parliamentary arrogance.

The Chairman: I have already related my views, and I think the ruling I gave as to the debate on the general motion is applicable to the amendment before the house because there is only reference to \$10,000. I would think the hon. member for Essex East has not shown up to now much co-operation with the Chair in complying with the ruling it has made which, although it may not be to his liking, should be abided by unless it is appealed.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, if you felt I was not co-operating with you, I would have thought you could well have pointed that out to me some ten minutes ago. I suggest, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, that in trying to point out the reasons why we have no confidence in this administration we should be allowed to show the way that this problem has been dealt with in one other country. I find it difficult to appreciate this reasoning.