

without work because progress is here, because machines are taking the place of man, and because those machines do not ask for a salary the way workers do. After that, a program will have to be implemented which enables the federal government, the various departments, the provincial and municipal governments, to undertake a vast public works program designed to give the people the services they need.

That is where I agree with orthodox economists whom I have often had occasion to criticize in this House because I felt it was my duty to do so. Those conventional economists suggest as a means of making up for deficiency of private enterprise, of government bodies, as a means of giving employment so that everyone can have an income, as a means of increasing or giving purchasing power to those who do not have a steady job, those economists suggest public works programs to give everyone a chance to earn some purchasing power. The purchasing power will not only have contributed to produce consumer goods but to produce services which we could enjoy in this world and which could also benefit future generations. Now a public works program as a means of dealing with unemployment is an excellent policy provided that future generations are not burdened with the production of goods which are now needed.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion and as a third suggestion, I would like to remind the hon. members and members of the executive that such public works should be financed not through taxes but with credits created by the Bank of Canada and refunded in the same way as the credits created by chartered banks. The only difference is that the interest rate would be much lower because the Bank of Canada should not operate to make profits but to provide services. The only interests paid would serve to cover administrative costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if we did it this way we would contribute to decrease inflation. Some of our opponents have always tried to ridicule our ideas and suggestions—not you, I know you as being sincere and honest people. However, there are people outside this House whose mission is to ridicule everything we do here, be it on the side of the majority, or on the side of the official opposition or on the side of the opposition parties, the ones that are called the “small” parties. I do not mind being called a member of a “small” party because in the Gospel, Jesus Himself did say to let “small” people come to Him. He loved small people and I am sure He still does.

Mr. Speaker, this formula which I am proposing most respectfully and sincerely, think we should put it to the test. We have made so many experiences here and there which have failed, that I suggest we should at least try a formula in which I, and a number of financial experts today, sincerely believe. Why borrow from others what we ourselves can produce? Why go and draw water from our neighbour's well when our well is filled to capacity with perfectly good and pure water? Why borrow elsewhere? Why have the chartered banks borrow the funds we need to expand the public sector when we have our own bank which can operate and do the same job for a better price?

Income Tax Act

Mr. Speaker, let us examine this very carefully. I am sure that if the House analyses this situation and goes to the bottom of this, it will realize that the hon. member for Bellechasse has come up in his remarks with three useful suggestions which deserve to be put to the test and will certainly not bankrupt our country. There is no risk involved. In fact, the way things are going right now, we are very likely to end up in bankruptcy.

Therefore, to stay afloat while there is still some vigour left in us, parliament could certainly convince this government to introduce legislation which would be the extension of the one we are dealing with today and which would make it possible to achieve the results parliament has in mind, namely, to provide all Canadians with enough purchasing power to meet their needs.

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help making a few remarks about this piece of legislation. First it should be well understood that when the government accepts recommendations from the opposition—that does not happen often—and yet they are always intelligent recommendations. But this time the government could not refuse to consider a legislation or a recommendation designed to create employment. We would rather have had the government do it a few months ago when the official critic of the opposition pointed it out in the House on behalf of our party. Nevertheless we will support this legislation which is before the House because it contains some elements of solution.

It is certainly not the ultimate solution but we realize that it deals with an urgent issue and we will obviously not hesitate to support this legislation. In addition, we will do our best to be short so that the government can implement it at the date set in and in the most efficient way. That does not prevent me from urging the government to pay close attention to the monitoring and implementation of this program. It is obvious that in any legislation providing for subsidies to certain classes of people, one will try by all possible means to obtain the most and, unfortunately, from time to time an attempt will also be made to justify a subsidy that is not always justifiable. In view of the circumstances, I feel it is our duty to ask the government to watch very closely the implementation of this act.

We have been advocating a similar program for a long time. May I repeat again that the government could have thought of it at least two years ago. For two years now we have lived through an intolerable situation and, in light of the steady increase in unemployment and in the cost of living, we knew full well that legislation would have to be brought in. Why wait so long? I will attempt to prove my point. It seems that, during those two years the government decided to maintain a million unemployed through various band-aids it introduced. It may be that the government thought that with such programs as the LIP, the Opportunities for Youth Program and the new Canada Works Program, the economic woes of the country would be solved. I hope no one thinks that. But as few other formulas have been found to generate employment, we, on this side of the House, as thousands of Canadians, have to think that the government has nothing rather to suggest than a few