

*Economic Rehabilitation*

in a new unit last fall. There were two immense furnaces side by side. I was told that one was fired by coal and one was fired by oil. As I recall it—I may be wrong in this—the information I obtained was that the cost was approximately equal.

I expressed the idea then, and I do it again now, that if that was the case, why would it not have been better to have used coal entirely? On the other hand, as was brought out this afternoon, we have a great refining plant across the harbour, and if they could not get use for part of their fuel oil I presume they would have to cut down the refining operations. It is therefore sort of a toss-up between the two.

I have rambled on at some length—

**An hon. Member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Purdy:** I agree that it has been at some length, but I have heard the hon. gentleman talk longer and say less than I have said. As I say, I believe that the best way to meet this problem—and it is a problem—is to follow out the program laid down by the Minister of Labour. I agree with him 100 per cent when he says that in those places where there is depression owing to the closing down of industry, they will do everything they can to put the people through vocational training and train them for other positions. But I do not think you can take people holus-bolus from their heart-roots and from the graves of their ancestors and move them from one place to another in a democracy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the maritime provinces I am one of those who believe that although we have had some rather difficult times, we are doing something. There is the fighting will to win in that part of the country, and I think we will win through. I was going on to say that I believe the problem is being reasonably well handled at the present time. I would not want to be branded as one who would even suggest we refused to help communities which are absolutely down and out, and where the people have done their very best. I would certainly support any legislation introducing any scheme that would aid such a community. However, if it were of general application I do not think it would work out. I take the same attitude toward these communities as I would to an individual who came to me for help. If I were sure he had tried hard and could not make a success, I would give him some help. I would certainly support the government if they took the same stand. I am of the opinion, however, that we cannot, as a nation, legislate ourselves into prosperity. I am afraid this program would be leading up to that.

In so far as most communities are concerned, I think the solution of these problems will be brought about by a continuation of the type of government we have had in this country since 1935. You will recall that figures show that our gross national product was \$4 billion in 1931 and today it is \$26,600,000,000. This, of course, is the result of Liberal policies.

In support of my statement concerning the solution of these problems, which will recur at a few points in the future, I should like to quote one paragraph from the submission of the Canadian Manufacturers Association to the royal commission on Canada's economic prospects. It is under the heading of "Population and Employment". Under the sub-heading "Population" it has this to say:

In its vision of a greater Canada, the association has examined the studies of a number of recognized Canadian authorities as to what the population and gross national product of Canada will probably be in 1980. Obviously, any prediction is subject to a rather wide margin of error, based as it is on certain assumptions such as no major war occurring in the next 25 years, birth rates continuing at, or close to, present levels, low death rates as now, substantial immigration, and continuing technological improvement. Our considered estimate, taking the foreign factors into account, is that the population will be from 26 million to 28 million in 1980 and the gross national product will be from \$68 billion to \$72 billion (at present prices). As regards the gross national product especially, this estimate is likely on the conservative side.

On the basis of past experience the Canadian labour force in 1980 might be from 9 to 10 million. The association believes firmly that the most important single task of the people and government of Canada is to make as adequate provision as possible for the economic and steady employment of this labour force.

It has been noted that the percentage of the labour force employed in the primary industries is decreasing whereas the percentage employed in manufacturing is increasing. This trend will continue. It is the manufacturing industry that must provide a great deal of the employment for an increased population.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say this. I noted in one of our newspapers the other day that the wife of an ambassador who had been assigned to Ottawa had this to say: In her experience the women of the world were very much alike. They wanted to look after their families and their homes. Now, I would say that I believe the interests of the men lie along the same lines. They want to look after their families and their homes, and they are willing to work to do that. If we all get behind the problem in Canada and in Nova Scotia and apply ourselves, I do not think there will be any necessity for the program requested in the hon. member's resolution.

**Mr. J. H. Blackmore (Lethbridge):** It may seem presumptuous on my part to enter the