

*The Budget—Mr. Pickersgill*

merit all the paraphernalia of a budget but which might be a little helpful," and had done this in a modest way and then allowed the results to speak for themselves, possibly six months hence there might have been some results to gratify the minister. But the minister cannot do things in that way. His method is the opposite one; he tends to blow things up into great balloons and, like all balloons, the minister's eventually burst. The expectations aroused by the minister both before and after the budget are of a character which cannot possibly be realized by any of the results that are likely to follow.

I am sorry that the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Flemming) is not in the chamber at the moment. He was here a few moments ago, and I wanted to make a reference to him. I think we from the Atlantic provinces all expected that when this great star from New Brunswick—perhaps I should call him a fallen star—came into this house, those fiscal ideas and those claims for the Atlantic region which he professed so loudly from Fredericton would reflect themselves in the budget of his namesake after he became a member of the government. It is pretty disappointing to everyone from the Atlantic provinces to see that the only reference to the Atlantic provinces is that we cannot have regional policies in this country. I paraphrase the minister's statement on that.

I want to say one or two words about one feature of this budget which I think is wholly bad. I may say that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) correctly anticipated that I would say something about this. He correctly anticipated it, of course, because he was perverting history in his speech yesterday. The hon. gentleman was very anxious to suggest that the parentage of these made in Canada proposals of the Minister of Finance was wholly Liberal. He referred to Mr. Fielding in 1904 and even dragged in poor Sir Clifford Sifton by the heels.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** What was poor about Sir Clifford?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** He was having a poor time in the government at that time, as the hon. member knows, and resigned shortly afterward. But then the hon. member attempted to cloak this proposal in the ample folds of the cloak of Mr. Mackenzie King, and said that this government was going back to 1936, to the position taken by Mr. King which had been eroded—I am not sure if that was the hon. member's exact word—

**Mr. Pallett:** Chiselled.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Yes. Of course the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Pallett), who supplied

the word, would know what that word means. I think I will accept the amendment; the word was "chiselled".

The fact of the matter is, of course, that what the government is doing is precisely what it did two years ago over dumping. It is going back just a little beyond 1936. It is going back to Bennett and arbitrary provisions giving all power to the minister, taking it away from parliament and taking away any appeal to the tariff board or on points of law to the courts, and going back to the fine old system they had in the days of Mr. Bennett when you could treat one firm one way and another firm another way, and one commodity one way and another commodity another way. I am not going to go on and debate that point today because there will be opportunity to do so on the resolution and on the bill.

I have a number of other observations I wish to make. There is one great difference; at least Mr. Bennett was not ashamed of what he was doing. In doing it he did not pretend he was a Liberal; he came out honestly and straightforwardly and not in the sly, furtive manner which is so characteristic of the Minister of Finance in dealing with trade. The Minister of Finance, of course, has emulated Mr. Bennett in another matter. He is now threatening the British; he is now waving a big stick at Mr. Macmillan, who apparently is cringing somewhere in Whitehall, fearing to have any closer relations with Europe because of the tremendous threat of retaliation from Eglinton.

What else is the minister doing? He is saying to Mr. Macmillan, "If you do not play ball we are going to rush into the arms of Uncle Sam". That is a shorthand version of the minister's speech at Ste. Adele.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** It is an erroneous Pickersgillian version, with no resemblance to the facts.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The hon. member for Halton talked about Liberal isolation; he talked about Liberal isolation in relation to the Leader of the Opposition, a man who, as much as any other man anywhere in the world, was responsible for the North Atlantic alliance. He need have no worry about the Liberal party leading this country into isolation, but I think we have every reason to worry about the Tory government leading this country into commercial isolation if it continues to follow the line it is following, both in this budget and in previous budgets.

Of course I do not think these made in Canada provisions were the main reason that we had a budget or indeed that we had a session before Christmas in which to have a budget. In one of those candid moments