

brought before the house to provide such assistance would, I believe, be given favourable consideration.

Such steps had to be taken in countries like Great Britain because industry had a great reluctance to moving from one locality to another, no matter how great the advantages might be.

During the next few days a number of workers will be coming to Ottawa asking for a halt to be placed on what I might term the runaway of industry, where industries are leaving centres that were dependent on them for many years and going to other areas where they hope to be able to pay lower wage rates and, in some cases, get closer to the larger marketing centres. The government has a responsibility in this field and if it does nothing to meet the problem it will be responsible for much of the blame. In saying that, I may add that if a Liberal government were in power I do not believe it would do any better. The Liberals already had a chance to do it, and they did not do as much as the present government has done. While we may not be completely happy with this legislation, at least we are getting three pieces of legislation which attack the fringe of the problem.

As I say, past governments were very reluctant to do this and, if the present government does not do it, the only alternative will be to elect a New Democratic party government pledged to carry out such a program. Having listened to the previous speaker, who had a great deal of experience in forest industries in the province of Quebec, I believe we could expect assistance from his group in joining us to see that the type of legislation we advocate is given to Canadians.

Mr. Byrne: Coalition?

Mr. Peters: No, not a coalition; but I would be quite happy to have the hon. member for Kootenay East read some statistics that come from official publications. It would be of assistance to him in being more exact in his facts. He said he had experience in the mines and I presume at one time he was a miner. I have a great deal of sympathy with miners and I am sure the hon. member would be welcome to join us if he would be more exact in his facts.

We are going to plan for industry and industrial development. We are not going to leave it up to free enterprise or entirely up to labour and management, because labour and management do not fully control industry. If big business had complete control of this country, instead of majority control, it would be able to do this; but under the circumstances I suggest the government must play a leading role in the redistribution of

industry, the redistribution of manpower and the redistribution of some of the wealth of the country to make sure that national development is designed for the people of the country, rather than for the profits of shareholders in very large corporations which have little or no interest in Canadian people and Canadian development.

(Translation):

Mr. Chapdelaine: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the resolution introduced by this government actually deals with the ills that are crippling most industrialized countries as well as those that are less developed. Moreover, if those ills are allowed to go unchecked, they will bring about the downfall of the free world.

I am also pleased to note that the government, even at this late date, is beginning to realize that the situation has become serious, a fact that others had foreseen half a century ago.

We see by this resolution that the government is anxious to look into the unemployment problem resulting from automation which, from the very start indicated that the ills we are now experiencing in the labour field were bound to happen.

If we examine the evolution of automation, we realize that at the end of the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth, when scientists started to find means of replacing manpower, it could already be foreseen that automation, instead of displacing manpower, as was first believed, was bound eventually to replace workers. Conventional economists with their philosophy of inflation and deflation, of unemployment, austerity and prosperity cycles which adjusted themselves only in wartime are still saying nowadays that automation is only displacing manpower. Well, we must look at the facts and recognize that economists are more and more in the wrong. And the government introduces today a resolution which tends to recognize that all across the nation, automation is replacing manpower.

What is exactly automation if not the outcome of human intelligence? In face of that problem, should we bar automation to give jobs to workers who were replaced by machinery? I think that would be an unsound attitude and an insult to God who gave us the required brain-power to achieve a degree of automation which will leave us free to put our brains to work instead of our hands.

The Social Credit party understood at first the immediate effects of automation. In fact, in 1933, a Social Credit theorist Maurice Colburn, wrote in his book, page 63, the following story to help understand the dilemma in