that he has it. Instead he looks for a medication likely to cure it. The Premier and the Minister of Labour seem alarmed by the crisis through which Quebec is going.

• (9:30 p.m.)

According to the latest figures, unemployment has reached 8.4 per cent, its highest rate since last fall.

Mr. Bourassa does not hide the fact that the number of unemployed has reached a really disturbing level, while Mr. Cournoyer does not hesitate to predict "a revolution" if unemployment keeps on increasing at that rate for a few years.

Mr. Bourassa stated that "Clearly one must not try to disguise the truth."

For a long time truth has been disguised and poultices put on wooden legs, and yet uneasiness continues, in fact it keeps getting worse.

I read further:

The Minister of Labour stated "If the situation is not corrected, the number of revolutionaries will grow. If we do not take all necessary steps and if we do not face up to our responsibilities. I am afraid we shall not have enough policemen to control the behaviour of those who will have suffered under the system."

Mr. Cournoyer's words came as an echo to those of Mr. Fernand Daoust of the Quebec Federation of Labour who had previously stated "it is going to blow up soon if enough jobs are not created".

Those statements are not liable to inspire confidence but rather to encourage opposition parties which have nothing to lose to reject all responsibilities on the government.

You only need to read the explanations given by Messrs Lévesque and Parizeau to get an idea of their objectives. Three weeks before the Chambly election, they have a first class reason to go and fight the government.

It is of the utmost importance that our administrators should become more responsible and settle once and for all this economic problem, for it is high time that we adopt a definite position. Whatever positions we have taken until now have been all wrong and have failed to cause any improvement in the situation. All this medicine that was provided could not prevent the cancer from persistantly gnawing at our economy until its final destruction.

The problem is more serious than is suggested by this motion submitted by the Conservatives. I wonder whether it was brought up merely for the sake of filibustering, but this motion should definitely be one of the most serious ever considered in this House. It should be discussed most seriously and I suggest grudges and party politics be set aside in order to find a genuine solution to the economic problems of the day. These problems are serious and there is not much time left to try and find solutions.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner).

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have been sitting here all evening and have consulted a number of hon. members of this House. Apparently quite a few hon. members have done considerable research into the subject being discussed and are prepared to speak this evening. However, as a result of our limited time they will not be able to do so. This sort of

## Employment Programs

thing happens frequently, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it is not time to break with tradition and allow hon. members to file speeches that they have prepared for the record, as is done in some legislatures.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon, member should know that it is within the discretion of the Speaker to recognize an hon, member. The Chair is trying to be as fair as possible in giving various representatives in the House an opportunity to make their speeches. This question cannot be discussed in the House. The only procedure under which the hon, member can raise that point is by moving a motion to be heard in place of another hon, member.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I certainly was not charging the Chair with discrimination or even suggesting that the Chair was discriminating against any party in the House. I believe implicitly in the fairness of the Chair and am not questioning that at all. I recognize that the Chair has a difficult task in choosing hon. members to speak.

I will not attempt to make my speech tonight. I was attempting to suggest that since there is insufficient time for all hon. members who wish to speak to be heard, there might be unanimous consent to allow some of my colleagues who have prepared their speeches and who obviously will not gain the floor tonight to file their remarks and have them printed, as if spoken, in *Hansard*. There is precedent for that practice even in this House because unanimous consent is granted to parliamentary secretaries and the House leader to file long—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair has listened to the point raised by the hon. member with sympathy, but the rules of the House do not permit him at this time, when the hon. member for Thunder Bay has been given the floor, to make a speech or to attempt to solve a problem of procedure. If the hon. member wishes to solve that problem he should do so by moving a motion or by suggesting to the Committee on Procedure and Organization that the rules of the House be changed. As far as the Chair is concerned, there is no precedent for the hon. member's suggestion and there is no possibility of tabling speeches in this House. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Rose: I rise on the same question of privilege. I do not wish to try Your Honour's patience—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair is not in a position to argue the matter with the hon, member and has no alternative but to recognize the hon, member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. member that I would be quite prepared to file my speech, but if that is not allowed I will "file it down" so that others will have an opportunity to speak.

It is well known that during the decade of the 1960s there was a period of seemingly uninterrupted and even uninterruptible economic growth. During that period the