

*The Address—Mr. Mather*

given what amounts to an historic fishing right in the publication field. The government's stand may do more harm than good to the Canadian publication industry and to the fostering of that free and independent Canadian feeling, which I am sure we are all keen to see brought about.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we were told in the election campaign that the government planned a very fine pension plan for Canada. It was going to do this and going to do that for the people of the nation. We find now that the pension plan, like the 12 mile fishing limit and like the Canadian publication regulations, has been very much watered down, due to the financial pressure of the provinces and the insurance companies. Again we were told during the election that the government planned to extend 10,000 scholarships to deserving students, but now in reality we find that they are going to get interest free loans, which is a quite different and minor thing. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we and a great many others in the house and in the country are not satisfied with the government's whoa, whoa, slow, slow, no, no attitude. We are not satisfied with it and we are going to do what we can to impel the government forward and get some worth-while efforts out of it for the mass of ordinary Canadians. I feel that the government does itself as well as the country harm by its present weak-kneed attitude. If it would take its courage in both hands and go forward boldly with a made in Canada for Canadians policy, I think it might be surprised with the widespread support it might still elicit. It is no use criticizing without offering something in the way of alternative proposals.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Mather:** Mr. Speaker, when the house rose I was saying that, having given the government every opportunity during the last session to deliver the goods it had been selling during the previous election campaign, the New Democratic party is of the opinion that in this session it is up to us more than ever before to challenge the government on its backsliding ways, to urge it to improve its line and to ask it to rise to those better things which it perceived so vividly while it was on the hustings. I had said, though, that there was no point, and it was unfair, to criticize weaknesses without putting forward some alternative proposals.

I am putting forward these specific points, therefore, at this time. In the international sphere, since we are all living in the same interdependent world today whether we like it or not, I believe one of the best things the government of Canada could do, and should be doing a great deal more, is to try to arrange for better international feeling. I feel, and I am sure many other hon. members in all quarters of the house feel, that it is manifestly ridiculous to find Canada is able to recognize the revolutionary regime in south Viet Nam within 15 days of that regime seizing power, and yet it seems impossible for our government to make up its mind to recognize the regime that took power on mainland China 15 years after that regime was established. Whether we like it or not, it is the regime which governs the most populous country in the world and which is a good customer of this country. It can be a great power for good or ill in the world today. I am sure that there are hundreds of thousands of Canadians who feel the same way I feel, and there are many people in the United States who are coming to this point of view. I propose that Canada recognize mainland China in the year 1964.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to the sombre fact that between our defence costs and our payment of interest on our federal borrowings alone, we now spend the enormous amount of almost 40 per cent of all our federal tax revenues. I have calculated that we are spending almost \$2 million a day to pay the interest on our federal debt, and that we spend \$2 million every 14 hours to pay for our defence costs in a world in which many people are coming to the point of view that there is really no fundamental defence left for any country in the world.

I believe that a major revision of this vast and dubious area of our public spending is essential. Reform in this area of public expenditure could result in either a reduction of taxation, a reduction of our debt or an increase in social benefits, such as an increase in the benefits of old age pensions to people of 65 years without a means test. This is a measure which would be in line with the tragic needs of thousands of people in the country, while at the same time being in line with the modern and progressive effects of automation on employment. If we were able to bring about such a reform of our defence expenditures and our public debt, this would also provide money for the repatriation of some of our Canadian industries.

Personally, I agree with Premier Manning of Alberta when he says that he sees no reason why the central bank, in this age, cannot make low interest loans, at about 1 per