

The Budget—Mr. Pearson

One of the editors of the *Financial Post*, John Macdonald, had this to say on March 28, and this is a very good description of what has happened to the government and to the country through the policy of the government. This man said:

The government is in the position of being obliged to throw water upon the inflationary fires of its own making.

Surely, no member of the government, no member on the other side, will deny that if action had been taken a year and a half ago, in the summer of 1958; if a budget had been introduced in the fall of that year; if there had been an accounting to the people of Canada; if there had been a statement of the economic difficulties, economic possibilities, economic dangers in this country; if action had been taken at that time to meet some of those problems we would not have been in the situation we have been in in the last year. It cannot be denied by any honest member of the government that at that time the government was more concerned with the forthcoming general election than with the economic and financial position of the country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, some of the fires that the government are trying to put out now—and we will give them full credit for the efforts they are making—are, as the *Financial Post* man said, of their own making.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I might complete my remarks by reading a paragraph from a Canadian paper because the Minister of Finance reproached me a few moments ago for taking my quotations from outside Canada. Here is a paragraph from the *Peterborough Examiner*. I apologize to the Minister of Finance for ending on what may be an unduly personal note. He knows that I do this in no unfriendly way.

The hon. member for Eglinton, the Minister of Finance, is a man who deserves our respect and admiration; he is as supple in his opinions and in his economics as a pitchman selling kickapoo-joy-juice.

I do not know what that is, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it is not alcoholic. Then the editorial goes on:

In flexibility he stands head and shoulders above his cabinet colleagues and for plugging a hole he is swiftly off the mark. It is being said in Toronto that his budget is aimed at the self-indulgent and rich; actually it calls all sections of the country to relieve the treasury from its financial plight.

That financial plight, is in large part at least the result of both bad management and bad faith on the part of the government. That is why we on this side have moved this amendment on which we will now proceed to vote and which we on this side will certainly strongly, sincerely and enthusiastically support.

[Mr. Pearson.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources took exception to the interpretation put on certain statements of his and I promised him an opportunity before the vote to make a correction.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most important for the accuracy of the *Hansard* record that I make very clear precisely what my two points of privilege were. The first was that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) was trying to mislead the house with regard to the facts as stated by the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Habel: You have got a lot to learn yet.

Mr. Speaker: I would hope that no member would try to mislead the house.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I would hope so too but unfortunately that does occur. I want to make it clear for the record—

Some hon. Members: Withdraw.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):—that when the Leader of the Opposition referred to the answer I made in the house on April 8 the inference was very clear that he was taking the percentages in this answer which referred only to approximately 2 per cent of all the land under permit in the northern areas. He said that the percentages he quoted with respect to United States companies or Canadian subsidiaries of United States companies applied to the whole northern area. I have to say flatly that that was not only incorrect but can only be excused by abysmal ignorance or a complete attempt to mislead.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Nine forty-five.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): My second point of privilege was this. When I asked through you, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: Nine forty-six.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle):—if the Leader of the Opposition would read my answer he proceeded to read the questions quickly.

An Hon. Member: Nine forty-seven.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): I will speak very slowly at this point, Mr. Speaker, and *Hansard* will bear me out that he started to read my answer but he left out several words at the beginning of it. His voice was heard to come in on the words "sale on March 9" and he left out the words, "assuming that the information required is the one", which is followed by the words "sale on March 9", that sale being just under three million acres. I therefore submit—