

*Unemployment*

**Mr. Garson:** As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, your intervention to advise me that my time is up has occurred almost at the precise moment when I have exhausted my material.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Go on. As a matter of fact I think the minister is long over his allotted time because of the time he spoke the other night, but he should continue anyway.

**Mr. Garson:** I can do no more than to recapitulate that the reason I am strongly opposed to the hon. member's amendment and intend to vote against it is that even if it were conceded that we could cure a problem of this sort by police court action, I think his amendment is still defective. I think it is defective as an amendment and I also think it is fundamentally misconceived and defective because this is not the proper method to deal with a problem of this kind. There is also the additional reason why we should not deal with it in this way at the present time, namely that it is being dealt with quite effectively in the proper manner and by proper authorities, the provincial governments concerned.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** On an interprovincial river?

On motion of Mr. Campbell the debate was adjourned.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** May I remind hon. members that at eight o'clock the house will resume the business which was interrupted at five o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

**SUPPLY**

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Harris for committee of supply, and the amendment thereto of Mrs. Fairclough, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Regier.

**UNEMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Alistair Stewart (Winnipeg North):** There are now, Mr. Speaker, between 600,000 and 700,000 unemployed in this country. There is no more serious domestic problem than this; yet the degree of importance which the government attaches to it can be seen in the way they have treated this debate since its inception almost four weeks ago. It

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

has been kicked about from pillar to post. It has had to make way for the most inconsequential legislation, and that I think is evidence of the degree of the government's real interest in the matter. In the conduct of the house business there has been nothing more incompetent than the way this debate has been run. That being so, we need not be surprised at the incompetent way in which the suffering of so many hundreds of thousands of Canadians is being treated today.

It has been said before in this debate, and I repeat it, that it is high time the Prime Minister spoke. After all, he is the leader of the government. He has to take his measure of responsibility. It is not good enough for the Prime Minister of Canada to just sit tight and say nothing, to present no program at all for his government. We expect something more than that. His predecessor would have given us much more. At least we would have been inundated with a barrage of words, words indeed so confused and confusing that the very faculties of eyes and ears would have been confounded. But not this Prime Minister; he plays it rather differently. If I may here paraphrase a dramatic criticism I read once, he plays King as though somebody else had the ace. It is not good enough. The fact that he desired to remain silent is no excuse at all for him or for the government. At least the late prime minister had some ideas as to what should have been done about 15 years ago in connection with the plight of the employable unemployed. Mr. King said then that to transfer to this government the whole cost of the employable unemployed would prevent a repetition of the confusion, inefficiency, waste, delay and inequalities which admittedly have prevailed in relief since 1930. The Liberal party believed that 15 years ago, yet nothing has been done about it.

Mr. King said that to transfer the whole cost of the employable unemployed would prevent a repetition of confusion, yet this government revels in confusion. He said that it would prevent a repetition of inefficiency, but the government wallows in its own inefficiency. Mr. King said it would prevent a repetition of waste, but the government glories in waste. He said it would prevent a repetition of delay, and the government delights in delay for obviously it is hoping that by delay the problem of unemployment somehow or other will be solved. Mr. King said that to transfer the whole cost of employable unemployed would prevent a repetition of the inequalities which we have seen, yet this government seems to exalt those very inequalities.