

Throughout all this, the Canadian government has commandeered quite important groups to analyse the situation. Among these agencies is the Economic Council of Canada, which, in December 1964, submitted its first review entitled "Economic Goals for Canada to 1970".

That agency's second annual review was published in December 1965, entitled: "Towards sustained and balanced economic growth".

In November 1966, another review was produced on "Prices, Productivity and Employment".

In September 1967 a review by the Economic Council of Canada was published, entitled "The Canadian Economy from the 1969's to the 1970's."

In September 1968, another review was published, entitled "The Challenge of Growth and Change."

In September 1969, another review was published to make us aware of Canada's perspectives for 1975.

Mr. Speaker, all these reviews produced by the Economic Council of Canada having failed to make a meaningful contribution to date, are now making proposals for 1975.

Mr. Speaker, without knowing them, I am convinced that those who are responsible for the Economic Council of Canada make comments on coming years simply because they know they will no longer be there then.

Study No. 17 of the Economic Council of Canada was presented in November 1967, and was entitled "Economic Cycles in Canada." On page 25 of that report, we read, and I quote:

The identification of the "reference" cycle is based on the overall performance indicated by the "peaks" and the "troughs" of the "particular cycles" . . .

Further on, we read this:

The period between the trough or lowest point in a reference cycle and the peak or highest point of return is generally known as "expansion". The period between a peak and the following trough is called a period of "contraction".

On page 23 of the same report, Mr. Speaker, we find something fantastic, and I quote what its authors had to say:

In length, economic cycles can vary from over one year to ten or twelve years;

Mr. Speaker, after reading that report, one can assert that the Pharaoh's economists mentioned in the Bible were surer of themselves than the economists who now surround the Prime Minister. You will recall that the Pharaoh had been warned that there would be seven years of abundance following seven years of famine. That was clear.

Today, in this country, to justify poverty in the midst of plenty, the economists take no chances. In fact, the economists surrounding the Prime Minister state in their reports that:

—economic cycles may vary from one to 10 or 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, to suppress hardship, poverty and insecurity among the Canadian people, certain measures are required. Those measures must of course be somewhat different from all that is being done at the present time and that has led the people to this imbalance to which we are referring and that we want to correct.

Speech from the Throne

To get off the beaten track, Mr. Speaker, it has to be conceded that the situation is not what it was 75 or 100 years ago. It has to be conceded that following the technological revolution man, as a worker, is more and more replaced by the machine. Anyone who reflects upon the progress of machines which keep increasing in number must logically conclude that our civilization is heading toward the establishment of a system where, on the one hand, human labour tends to decrease constantly and to be replaced by machines while on the other production has a tendency to increase indefinitely.

Now, these two logical consequences of technology are in the present state of the economic system quite incompatible.

Man can get products—even if they are in great abundance—only by working but at the same time machines are taking jobs away from him, hence the infernal cycle of economic crises, unemployment and unfortunately, wars which find there one of their main causes.

• (2030)

It is in time of peace that we discover more easily the victims of our present system because the whole production is directed toward regular consumption.

Since workers have less and less to do in the manufacturing of products, fewer and fewer products are sold while there are more and more unemployed.

So there is only one way out: to get rid of that economic rule whereby every product must have a commercial value and to admit that some products may be depreciated, in other words given free of charge.

Some hon. Members: Here it comes.

Mr. Godin: The minimum living wage is a necessity. Our country has and will have at its disposal more and more means of living that were inconceivable at the time of the ox plow.

It has been said time and again that the machine has to serve man and not the other way round. One infallible way to put automation at the service of man is to distribute profits equitably. It is as clear as that.

Without raw materials and natural resources, a country is at a disadvantage. However, we Canadians are blessed in this regard for we are amply endowed with both.

Some hon. Members: Now, he is coming to it.

Mr. Godin: We also have an adequate transportation system, highways, navigable rivers and railway and air transport systems that can be improved if necessary.

When we consider our manufacturing facilities, we find that many are operating below capacity and that some have closed altogether.

There is no shortage of manpower in Canada. The stagnation in our plants is caused by our failure to sell our end products.

The goods that fill our stores and warehouses are Canadian products or products exchanged with other countries. For all practical purposes, this production that fills our stores and warehouses may be regarded as Canadian.