

*The Budget—Mr. Chevrier*

to what the Leader of the Opposition said on many occasions, may be summed up in these three words: "Unity without uniformity."

Before concluding my remarks on this matter, I should like to reply to those that I shall not call parrots, for I do not want to be impolite, but to the backbenchers who have constantly mentioned the name of Mr. St. Laurent.

What did Mr. St. Laurent do? I shall tell those hon. members: in 1951, there was only one question on ethnic origin. It was question 17: What is your origin? There was a choice of 18 answers. The Canadian origin, which, incidentally, is not an origin but a nationality, did not appear at all in question 17 in 1951. Here are the facts as they happened. Mr. St. Laurent or the government of the day was asked what should be done should an individual say: I have no origin, I prefer to say I am a Canadian. Mr. St. Laurent simply answered: There is an open space at the end of question 17; you may write: "Canadian origin".

But neither the former government nor Mr. St. Laurent have ever given instructions, as did this government, to place at the top of the list the term "Canadian origin".

I now come—

**Mr. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Temisca-  
mingue):** Before the hon. member goes on to another matter, may I ask him a question?

**Mr. Chevrier:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, provided that I am allowed more than 30 minutes and that the time taken by this question be deducted of my allotted period.

**Mr. Speaker:** Obviously, I cannot agree to the request of the hon. member, unless the house gives its unanimous assent. Otherwise, the time taken by the questions would have to be part of the hon. member's allotted period.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Well, you will have to ask your question at the end of my remarks.

**Mr. Martineau:** I believe the hon. member has been give the consent of the house.

**Mr. Chevrier:** In that case, I shall listen to the hon. member.

**Mr. Martineau:** Would the hon. member tell the house whether, in his opinion, the question concerning ethnic origin, as expressed yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, is better than the one that was used in the 1951 census form?

[Mr. Chevrier.]

**Mr. Chevrier:** Well, I do not know whether it is better or as good. The point is that the government, by its interference, has changed the nature of the question.

**Mr. Martineau:** My question was addressed to the hon. member, and I expect an explicit answer.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I say that the government, by its interference has changed the nature of the question and has tried to confuse the distinction between nationality and ethnic origin.

**Mr. Martineau:** The question is of a scientific nature and I would like a scientific reply.

**Mr. Chevrier:** If the hon. member would be good enough to put off his question until I have finished my speech, I shall have no objection whatever to it.

I shall now pass on to another aspect of the discussion, namely some of the statements made by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech.

Ever since the beginning of this session, the government has kept tooting its horn about what it has done, about the bold measures it claims to have taken to meet the situation. It has been doing it before the house met again in January, and since then.

There have been repeated references to this by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, and yet the changes made in the budget for the current fiscal year show very clearly the government's failure to act in that regard.

In fact, the so-called emergency program was adopted by the house before the supplementary budget was introduced, but it had no effect whatsoever on the budget itself. As proof of this, let me briefly analyse the figures given to us by the minister. On the expenditure side, he had to add \$100 million to his estimates of March 1960. Was this increase in the estimates designed to help the unemployed, to meet the present state of emergency? Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

As the house knows, this increase in expenditures is due to the increased deficit of the C.N.R., of the agricultural stabilization board, and to the one dollar per acre payment to western wheat producers.

If, therefore, the minister gave us an accurate picture of the financial situation of the government, the so-called special program adopted before the Christmas recess, will not cost a cent to the government during the current fiscal year.