

Unemployment Insurance

lucky we were to have "John" at the head of the government. They filibustered their legislation. Why was this done? It was done because the government's legislation is not ready yet. We have had nothing put on the order paper for six weeks except purely routine matters. We are supposed to be hastening toward the end of the session. We are asked to take estimates all week because the government cannot make up its mind what to do about the Unemployment Insurance Act or any other important measure that should be before this house.

Mr. Nowlan: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Pickersgill: The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Nowlan) would perhaps understand me if I were to say that the government should put up or—well, the minister knows the rest. Let us see this action. Let us see this new vision of the new Canada that was unfolded at London while the rest of us were asked to do the nation's business and the leader of the government was politicking down at London.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Pickersgill: Does the hon. member contend that was cheap? It was a pretty cheap thing for the Prime Minister to do.

Mr. Lambert: What you are saying is cheap.

Mr. Pickersgill: It was a pretty cheap thing for the Prime Minister to do. He is the head of the government, and he insisted on the rest of us being here. Where was he? He was politicking, emitting some hot air without any substance. If he had gone down to London and told them what was going to be done about the Unemployment Insurance Act, or told them what was going to be done about the fund or dealt with some of the problems of the country—

Mr. Starr: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Pickersgill: Certainly.

Mr. Starr: Would the hon. member advise the house where the leader of his party was and where the hon. member for Essex East was on Saturday?

Mr. Pickersgill: I would be very happy to do so. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) had an engagement which he had made before the Prime Minister forced this rule on the house which we opposed—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: I must say I am very glad the Leader of the Opposition was spared these 17 Tory speeches which bored the rest of us all day Saturday.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. More: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the hon. member has made an accusation that the Prime Minister forced Saturday sittings on this house. The amendment for Saturday sittings was introduced by a member of the C.C.F. party and the leader of the Liberals at that time did not know what to do. The house almost unanimously adopted that amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order; I think this discussion is entirely out of order. I think we should return now to a discussion of the amendment.

Mr. Pickersgill: As a matter of fact, I think that is a very sound idea. My time has nearly expired, and I want to say a word about the subamendment.

Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway): On the question of privilege that was raised—

Mr. Pickersgill: On a point of order, may I say that question of privilege was disposed of.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I can hardly decide in advance whether or not the hon. member's question of privilege is to be accepted.

Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway): In so far as the question of privilege is concerned, the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate said that Saturday sittings were forced on the house by the Prime Minister. I believe that statement should be withdrawn. It is entirely false and inaccurate, as was pointed out earlier. He should be required to withdraw.

Mr. Pickersgill: There is no question of privilege, but I will happily amend the statement. I will say that the 200 sheep followed the Prime Minister and the rest of us had to submit to it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: Then, the Prime Minister did not do us the courtesy of being here himself. I have amended the statement, and I hope that will satisfy the sensibilities of hon. gentlemen opposite.

I want to go back to the amendment, because it does seem to me that no one in this party will have an opportunity to speak again before the division. I may say that we in the official opposition are heartily in accord with the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue). In fact, the hon. member for Essex East began to urge this course in 1958, and he has been consistently urging it as have the rest of us who have spoken on this matter ever since that time. It is the only right and