

These are very general. The Prime Minister a moment ago, in inviting the leader of the opposition to observe the distinction between the two, said, "In this bill we provide for specific purposes." I suggest to the Prime Minister that there is no reference in this bill to specific purposes; they are very general. What are these proposals for public works and other projects? What are these effective means of mobilizing agencies for relief? And further, where is the long range plan of national development? I am not saying this in a critical spirit, but I do believe it would be far better for this parliament to lay down certain definite projects such as I have referred to—for instance, reforestation and an adequate housing program, which I do not regard as sufficient under the present housing act, and a definite program as well with respect to other measures that might be undertaken.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me say at once that is exactly what we are going to do. My hon. friend has evidently not noticed, and unfortunately perhaps did not hear, the references to Bill No. 19, which is to follow this present measure.

Mr. STEVENS: I have read it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Bill No. 19 is to assist in the relief of unemployment, the promoting of agricultural settlement and rehabilitation, and in the development, conservation and improvement of certain natural and other resources. When we come to that bill all these projects to which the hon. gentleman has referred, will be set out and no doubt very fully discussed. The bill before us deals simply with a national employment commission which will have supervision over all these projects. It will be an advisory body to assist the government with respect to them and other expenditures for relief and employment so as to ensure that all will be properly supervised and correlated.

Mr. STEVENS: With all due deference to the Prime Minister's interpretation of Bill No. 19, I regret to say that I cannot read into that bill any such specific references. I have read Bill No. 19, and in fact I was torn between the wish to discuss this matter under the bill now before us and to postpone until we have reached Bill 19 the remarks I have to make in this regard. What I am getting at is this. There is no denying that under this bill, by section 10, the governor in council is given extremely wide powers, and I am not quarreling with that; I do not criticize the government for taking these powers. I do say however that it would be infinitely better if, in taking these powers, the government intimated in a more specific way than it has

done here the general lines which relief was to take. Let me indicate why I have some apprehensions. A few moments ago the Minister of Labour said, "It is hoped that this will be only a temporary measure." What can you do towards a long range plan of national development or the carrying out of programs of public works and other projects when the very essence of your bill, the very essence of your policy is, as has been said on several occasions during this debate, that this is but a passing or temporary measure?

Mr. ROGERS: I think my hon. friend will agree that I used the word temporary in contradistinction to the permanence involved in the civil service. Obviously it is a relative term.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, but I go back to the preamble, in which I find this language:

—until such time as the normal revival of trade and industry will absorb a large percentage of unemployed workers.

Here again we have an indication that the government is resting its hope of a solution of the Canadian economic and social problem of to-day upon the time when there will be a normal revival of trade. Over and over again this session members of the government have pointed out that external trade is to be the solution of our internal problems. As far as I am able to do so, I wish to warn the Prime Minister and his colleagues that, in my opinion at any rate, they are leaning on a broken reed when they depend upon external trade to solve our internal problems, and I will venture to indicate briefly my reason for that statement. There is scarcely a country in the world, in the last six or seven years, and some of them for a period of about twelve years—starting with Italy, France and Germany—which has been a market for Canadian products, that has not put on high tariffs, quotas, inhibitions, prohibitions and other measures of impediment to embarrass the operation of a definite policy or, to use the language that has been used here, a long range policy. The long range policy of these countries has been to build up within their own national boundaries a self-sufficiency in relation to articles which we have been in the habit of exporting to them. Look at the price of wheat to-day, 78, May wheat, in spite of the fact that the world is supposed to be trembling on the brink of an international conflagration. In spite of that fact wheat is 78, dropping steadily. The government has been in office five months. What has been its experience in regard to the enlarging of the markets of the world for the sale of our wheat? I am