

Mr. Lang: This is easily learned by those in the NDP ranks who come from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Nystrom: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The minister said that I am distorting the facts; I suggest that I am not. The Prime Minister said that we had to tolerate 6 per cent unemployment and I suggest that the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is debate; this is not privilege. Hon. members should know the difference between privilege and debate. I suggest to the hon. member with respect, that if he wishes to continue the point I can allow him to continue in just a moment, but it is not in order to seek the floor on an alleged question of privilege when the only thing he wants to do is to try to correct what he considers statements of facts. Perhaps the hon. member might have an occasion later on that would be procedurally correct to deal with what he considers to be a misstatement.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege, I suggest that the minister is imputing motives. I have taken part in the debate—

Mr. Speaker: It is not my understanding of imputing motives. I do not suggest that the hon. member does not have the right to be dissatisfied with what has been suggested by the minister. That is his right, but it is part of the debate. I would think that the hon. member might have an opportunity later, either by himself or through one of his colleagues, to try to rectify anything that he thinks was not stated correctly.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly understand the hon. member being unhappy with my remarks as I was unhappy with his. We will solve the whole problem if he corrects the practice of misstating the views and statements which have been made on this subject by the government.

An hon. Member: Tell us what the Prime Minister said.

Mr. Lang: Economists everywhere understand that trying to achieve this balance is a very difficult issue. One of the reasons I wanted to enter this debate was the suggestion that education was misplaced in this country or that it was wrong to have further education for our youth as set out in the motion and the speech of the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Is the minister not going to discuss unemployment at all?

Mr. Lang: It is extremely important to have the faith which I and so many other people in this country have that education, training and upgrading are important and valuable, and that they will lead to better jobs, better conditions and higher productivity. The hon. member for

Employment of Graduate Students

Yorkton-Melville recognizes this in his subamendment. He recognizes the advantages of our training and upgrading programs. Many members have recognized these advantages in recent days by asking about the possibility of more programs. With the additions that have been made we will be spending \$300 million for training and upgrading programs, a vast increase over last year. This is a program of great magnitude which is relatively young in this country and is using the very important facilities already in existence. This has come about as a result of a program of grants and assistance on the part of the federal government which has made the necessary technical training places available to our young people.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Considering the kinds of monetary and fiscal policies being followed in this country and the optimism we share for the future of this country, our proper role is one that will help to continue to train our young people and that will urge them to acquire an education so that they may undertake those jobs through which they will make a greater and better contribution to the life of this country. We shall continue these programs and we shall continue them because we are optimistic that the economy is essentially sound and that the unemployment figures, which now are a source of regret to all of us, will decline as the balance of our policies begin to work.

It has been said many times in this House, and repeated not too long ago, that the problem of inflation is serious. It has brought to bear pressures on prices, profits and wages in particular areas and on particular groups. May I say to hon. members, and I know that hon. members of the New Democratic Party will applaud, that I am not one to shrink from a policy of wage and price controls, if that should become necessary. I will say immediately that one ought to recognize the difficulties inherent in such a policy. One would ordinarily want to move to selective policies in this area rather than to general policies, because otherwise there would be difficulties. That course should be embarked on if it becomes necessary as a result of the failure of other measures which may be less restrictive and less confining, and which would not exert such a degree of dictatorial guidance on the economy as would be the case if outright controls were implemented. It is of course our unwillingness to accept readily that dictatorial guidance which leads us to hesitate longer than our friends opposite would hesitate in the introduction of such policies.

It is clearly the hope of this government that our policies of monetary and fiscal expansion will, together with a gradual realization on the part of those with power that certain restraints are necessary, lead to the growth in the country that is required. We hope that lower unemployment levels will result. In the booming economy which we shall again see, there will be a shortage as opposed to a surplus of those with education and with skills and training.

The hon. member for Vegreville, in a speech that was somewhat inconsistent with some of the other speeches which have been made, was worried about the outflow