

money into less worth-while projects in the same district. While a school board is letting go one or two school teachers because of the lack of \$20,000, someone will be getting a cheque for \$20,000 to paint a mural in the school hallway. Here I am speaking generally and not of any particular case. But we could mention a hundred projects of no appreciable value to our society that, if dispensed with, the money provided for them could help children receive a decent education through the normal channels. It is hard to believe that the municipal dollar and the federal dollar are each worth the same 100 cents.

I have introduced the picture of municipal financing so that hon. members might realize what a shattering blow it is, to those charged with financial responsibility at lower levels, to be required to pay any part of welfare costs when such costs rise rapidly as the economy falters. The costs of welfare in small cities take up such an enormous proportion of their budgets that budgeting becomes a farce. If the federal government's budget indicates that we are in for another round of inflation or a further increase in unemployment, the unemployed of course may first collect unemployment insurance benefits but when their benefits run out they go on welfare. That is something not budgeted for.

We have been told that in holding this debate we are voting only a dollar for several plans. That, Mr. Speaker, is utter rubbish. It is this extreme dissatisfaction with the present financial and taxing methods that causes me to look with considerable favour upon the income development plan. The government must know that an entirely unfair burden is placed upon the lower levels of government. I do not have a closed mind about the income development plan. If the government is able to devise a better plan, I hope it will not hesitate to bring it forward. What is important is that the government should realize that the present system is unfair, undemocratic and guarantees that all Canadians do not and will not have equal opportunities in this land.

Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, this morning an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* was titled, "If necessary, an election." I do not wish to read the whole of it, simply because it is too lengthy. Nevertheless, there are a couple of paragraphs in it that should be read for the benefit of hon. members. And, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that this was written by the chief editorial writer of the *Globe and Mail*. It reads in part as follows:

Conservative leader Robert Stanfield made the unemployed one of the principal themes of his speech—

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is not that I have any objection to listening to this editorial in the *Globe and Mail*—I read such editorials, just like everybody else—but it is a rule of this House that editorials should not be read in debate. I think that should be brought to the attention of the distinguished hon. member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The point of order is well taken if the hon. member is referring to an article that he has called an editorial. However, I think I should listen a little longer to know what is being quoted.

Supply

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, you are very fair. As a matter of fact, the hon. member who brought this matter to your attention was very fair. I have nothing against his interrupting, but I wish he would interrupt some of his own colleagues whenever they read much more than I did. It is not necessary that I quote this editorial; as a matter of fact, I think I could almost quote it from memory, verbatim. But because it is an article in the *Globe and Mail* and because it refers to the leader of the opposition I want to be correct in every detail. Therefore, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall continue to read. It reads as follows:

Conservative leader Robert Stanfield made the unemployed one of the principal themes of his speech in the throne speech debate. He offered to shelve temporarily that debate if the government would immediately bring in legislation to increase old age pensions and clarify the Unemployment Insurance Act. His verbal concern for the unemployed has occupied him urgently since.

Those were the words. The performance has been to delay, often with time wasting and childish tactics, the bill to provide the money to pay unemployment benefits. This delay was carried to the point where—the Senate insisting on some time to consider the matter—benefits actually were delayed for Canadians who needed them.

Such behaviour so disregarded the needs of the country that three Conservative Members of Parliament broke with their party to support the government's bill. This in spite of the overwhelming desire of the Conservatives to bring down the government.

I do not think any more need be said about that matter. These are not my words; they are the words of one of the chief editorial writers in Canada, certainly one of the chief editorial writers in the great city of Toronto. So far as I am concerned, not only with regard to the debate during the past month but with regard to the present debate those words put the cards squarely on the table. The fact is that our hon. friends in the opposition—and of course they are our friends—accuse of us of not knowing what is going on in the country, and probably too often we accuse them of the same thing. In this particular instance they have obstructed the government in every possible way and have obstructed it in every possible way since we returned here last January 4.

The statement by my hon. friend opposite that the amendment introduced by one of the Conservative members, asking that these votes be reduced to \$1, was the only way that they could discuss these measures in the House of Commons is 100 per cent nonsense. They brought in this delaying tactic so they could obstruct the government in every possible way. There is no other explanation.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that on October 30 last a large percentage of the people of Canada voted for the great Conservative party and the Conservatives were successful in obtaining 107 seats. But sometimes the way they talk and criticize the government would lead one to believe that they had won about 135 seats and were the party in power instead of the one that sits to the right of Mr. Speaker.

• (1530)

May I remind you, Sir, and all hon. members present, that Liberal members do not sit in the House today with their heads down. If anybody won the election, we won it because we obtained more seats than any other party in