

*National Economic Development Board**(Translation):*

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Rimouski pretends that I have said the opposite of what the leader of our group, the hon. member for Red Deer has declared, to the effect that we are not in favour of planning—

(Text):

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There was no contradiction by the member who had the floor of anything said by the hon. member for Villeneuve and for that reason I rose to my feet. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) could rise and contradict any allegation that might be made on a point of privilege in respect of any statement he made himself outside of this house. It was for this reason I said there was no point of privilege. I pointed out that it was a matter of debate and that the hon. member for Villeneuve, in due course, could take the floor and argue the point.

Mr. Caouette: On the same question of privilege—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Caouette: I submit I was personally attacked.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Caouette: I was personally attacked. I am not going to accept this.

(Translation):

Mr. Habel: Put on your beret.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Habel and his beret. He is wearing one—if only there were something under it.

(Text):

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I think the Speaker has the floor. I ruled that there was no point of privilege. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Villeneuve is capable of responding to any allegation made in respect of his own leader during the course of debate. I am sure he will do so in due course. In so far as personal privilege is concerned, I do not believe there is any point. The hon. member for Rimouski.

(Translation):

Mr. Legare: Mr. Speaker, I understand, from the remarks that I heard, that he was in favour of planning; but here is what his leader said in this house, as is reported on page 2082 of *Hansard*:

Planning is in itself an excellent thing.

Mr. Gregoire: Planning of things and not planning of men.

Mr. Legare: What we have to do—and I refer my hon. friend for Lapointe to page 2082 where the member for Red Deer told us:

[Mr. Caouette.]

Planning that permits people collectively to work together.

And further—

This is the kind of planning that such an economic development board must do if it is going to accomplish anything positive for the country.

If the hon. member for Villeneuve is still of the opinion that he is against planning, he will probably have the opportunity to discuss the matter in other circumstances.

Now, if the hon. member, on the other hand, does not like me to find him in contradiction on that point, I shall do it on another one. Thus, when he stated in this house that we must give more attention to producing domestic consumption goods and that trade and exports must come next, he was then contradicting his leader, the hon. member for Red Deer, who just came back from a tour to find outlets for the country.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote only a few sentences from an article I should like to put on the record. That article was published in the Quebec paper *Le Soleil* on December 3, 1962, under the signature of Mr. Antoine Turgeon. I quote:

Planning means to set up a very comprehensive plan or rather a series of plans to serve as guides for action in the economic life of a country, of a province, of a region. Planning is the act itself that can include a very complex chain of social and economic measures.

And further, the article says:

The main role of economic planning is to eliminate unemployment as much as possible, to promote full employment and, all in all, to give the best social security that can be found. To reach that goal, the situation must be studied locally, in all the regions, experts must be consulted, put to work at reasonable salaries, the domestic markets, local, regional, national, must be studied.

In fact, that is exactly what the Liberal party has been suggesting to the government for the last three years, that is since the economic situation began to deteriorate in our country.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that my remarks have displeased my friends on the left, and I understand why. However, I would not like them to think that I will devote more time than I am allowed to correct the discrepancies and contradictions that may exist between the two leaders of that party, because I would need more than the 30 minutes I am allowed in this house.

(Text):

Hon. Pierre Sevigny (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, for the last 40 minutes or so we have been listening to a speech which has touched on almost every subject except one which normally should form the object of the present debate.