

The Budget—Mr. Pickersgill

of Trade and Commerce told us in the house or these figures in "The Record Speaks"? I suggest, sir, that it is a shocking thing to produce something which purports to be a record, which the government that authorized its production are ashamed to put on the records of the house because they know it is fiction.

Now, sir, there is another measure of unemployment they give all unconsciously. In this beautiful summary on page 1 they say:

The Progressive Conservative government has increased payments as follows—

Listen to these two instances, sir, and I will only give you two; unemployment assistance from \$8 million to \$40 million, up 408 per cent. Why is it necessary to pay four times as much unemployment assistance today as it was when we were in office? Why? Because there are at least four times as many unemployed; either that or the government is wasting money. I do not say there are four times as many unemployed, but I say there are four times as many unemployed needing assistance or the government is wasting money.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): You would not eliminate the threshold provision.

Mr. Pickersgill: The threshold provision would only account for perhaps \$1 million of that.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): You are away out again.

Mr. Pickersgill: The minister had better go on and account for the other \$28 or \$29 million. Then they refer to unemployment insurance payments increased from \$231 million to \$415 million, up 79 per cent. Is unemployment insurance paid to people who are not unemployed? Surely this is the best evidence of the difference between the situation as it was and as it is.

If you want another measure of the fictional character of this work, not going beyond page 1, consider the state of the unemployment insurance fund. It is true that we had some seasonal unemployment, and in two or three winters it was quite serious when we were in office, but every summer and every autumn the fund was restored until it was full again. Now, in spite of the 25 per cent increase in contributions imposed by the government, the fund is nearly empty.

I could go on and quote a lot of other things, but there is just one other thing in this little pamphlet to which I wish to draw particular attention. That is a statement made three times, as found on page 17:

And yet more than 80 per cent of personal income taxpayers continue to pay less than under the Liberal administration.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

To support that statement the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway put a table on *Hansard* yesterday in which he carefully gave the rates for 1959 and not the rates for 1960. Why? This is just another of the fictions of the supporters of this government. The rates for 1960 were higher as everyone knows, they were increased by the old age security increase. Perhaps I should not say this table was calculated to give this impression—I do not know why it was put in if it was not—but it was different from the facts. When you take the extra old age security tax paid by every income taxpayer, when you take the extra 1 per cent on the sales tax, and when you take the unemployment insurance increase, every taxpayer in this country is paying more today than he was in 1956, except those who have lost their incomes because they have lost their jobs. Unfortunately there are far too many of them.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): That statement is hopelessly untrue.

Mr. Pickersgill: The minister will have an opportunity to make his own speech in his own time. There is a quotation in this document to the effect that the government of Prime Minister John Diefenbaker has accomplished more for the ordinary man and woman in Canada than any government in our history.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pickersgill: This quotation is not attributed to anybody. There is no author given. However, there is only one man in Canada who, with a straight face, could say that and that is someone who never has anything but a straight face. It was not said by the Prime Minister, as many of you may have suspected. The Prime Minister has a certain sense of the ridiculous which would have prevented him from making this statement, although no doubt he was quite happy to have it made. There is only one man in the whole country, sir, I suggest, who would have had the immodesty, the effrontery and total lack of any sense of humour, any sense of proportion, to say that, and that is the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming).

Hon. George C. Nowlan (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, following the histrionic display we have just witnessed it is rather difficult to know where one should start or with what one should deal. Certainly the field is wide open, because the hon. member, having spent 10 or 15 minutes in castigating the hon. member for Halton for having dealt with the Liberal convention, then spent 28 minutes in dealing with an alleged Conservative handbook. There is, therefore, no question about what one may discuss in this budget debate.