

Economic Forecast for Current Year

document referred to by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not precisely the same as the document that was formerly produced, because it has another name, it obviously was, according to the description, for the same purpose.

I will not attempt to summarize the arguments advanced by the Prime Minister on publication of that document on January 20, 1958. I intend to produce them in his own words from *Hansard* because the Prime Minister's words in *Hansard* are my argument for the production of this document at this time. The situation is completely analogous. That document was prepared in March, 1957, on the eve of an election. This document I am asking for has been prepared—at least so most people seem to think—on the eve of another election. Therefore every argument which the Prime Minister used in connection with the one applies equally to the other.

I would draw Your Honour's attention to *Hansard* of January 20, which Your Honour will not have forgotten, January 20, 1958, at page 3526, where the Prime Minister said:

—I put it to the hon. members opposite—every one of them in the official opposition—

That is, the members of my party.

—that they hid the facts; they concealed the record; they did not let the Canadian people know what was taking place.

Later on the same page he said:

You secured the advice of the economists in your own departments and were advised as to what the situation was in March 1957. This record was given to each and every one of you—

At which point the hon. Leader of the Opposition interjected and asked the hon. gentleman what he was reading from.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thought the hon. gentleman knew of it before, but I am reading from the report "Canadian Economic Outlook" prepared by the economic branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce delivered in March 1957 at a time when my hon. friends opposite were telling the Canadian people how well things were going and were refusing to act.

How similar the situation is now to what the Prime Minister said it was then. Then, on page 3530 there is this sentence from the Prime Minister:

You concealed the facts. That is what you did.

Later on in the same column he said:

What did they do? They concealed the facts. They told the Canadian people that all was well; Utopia is here; there will be no more unemployment.

Mr. Churchill: It is quite irrelevant to the argument you are making.

Mr. Pickersgill: It is the Prime Minister's argument. It may be irrelevant but it is not irrelevant to what I am talking about.

Mr. Jones: We did give the people the facts.

Mr. Pickersgill: Later on, at the same page, Mr. Knowles said:

The Prime Minister did not hear my question. Has this document which the Liberals concealed been tabled? If not, will the Prime Minister table it so we can all see it?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not know that it has been. I would take it that it has, surely.

In other words, the Prime Minister felt it ought to have been tabled.

I would take it that it has, surely. If it has not been tabled my hon. friend has added one more example to the record of concealment by my hon. friends opposite.

Those were the arguments put forward by the present Prime Minister of the country as to why a document analogous to the document I am asking for, should have been made public by the government of that day at that time, and he accused us of concealing it, of hiding it. He took this thing onto the hustings and made a big issue of it. The Canadian people decided in his favour and presumably therefore gave their stamp of approval to what the Prime Minister did on that occasion.

I personally, if that precedent were not there, would never have made this motion. I made it only because the Prime Minister, who is supposed to be the supreme custodian of the rules and procedures of this house, said it was the right thing to do. If it was the right thing in his mind for the Prime Minister's predecessor to do, then surely the Prime Minister does not suggest that this government is governed by different principles and different rules of procedure? Surely if the Prime Minister's predecessor should have tabled this document and not hidden and concealed the facts, as he said he did, surely it is up to him to do it now under the same circumstances and on the eve of an election?

There is another argument and very good reason why this should be done. Hon. gentlemen opposite are going about the country talking about the great up surge in our economy. They are trying to give a certain impression about what this is. I am not saying that impression is right or wrong but they are doing that, and that is exactly what they said my friends and I did when we were in office in 1957. They are doing it now and they are refusing to let us have this document which would give us whatever evidence their experts might have in this regard.

If hon. members look at today's *Gazette* they will see this is very relevant. They will see that everyone in the country—I am not talking about politicians—does not agree with hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Speaker: I think—