

Supply—Labour

They are asking for \$88 million this coming year. Then they are boasting about increasing this unemployment relief. Did you ever in your life hear of any government in any country in the world boast about increasing unemployment relief by 800 per cent?

Mr. Baldwin: It is my recollection of the rules that when a member reads from what appears to be a valuable public document, he should put the whole document on file.

Mr. Pickersgill: This subject has been discussed a good many times here, and Your Honour knows very well that no one is permitted to table documents in the house except members of the government. I hope the hon. member, who is a very courteous member of the house, will not seek to join some of the less courteous ones in attempting to interfere with the continuity of what I have to say. What I am saying is that, not content with bankrupting the unemployment insurance fund and coming here and asking for a loan, which perhaps is not big enough, incidentally—and I wish to ask the minister a question about that matter at the conclusion of my remarks—they boast that they have increased relief or welfare by 800 per cent. I have heard governments make some queer boasts, but the queerest boast of all is to have increased relief by 800 per cent. It seems to me that one paragraph alone in this document is enough to destroy this government in every part of this country. Here is their list of achievements: increasing unemployment relief by 800 per cent. We on this side of the house regard unemployment relief as a necessary evil, something that should be as little necessary as possible, not something to boast about and say how big you are getting it, or how much you are spending on relief. That gives you, as I say, Mr. Chairman, an idea of this "Through the Looking Glass" attitude of this extraordinary government of mirror vision. That is the only expression one can apply. The Prime Minister looks at himself in the mirror, perhaps not as often as the Minister of Public Works does, and they admire themselves and see there what they want to see.

The Chairman: Order. I am sure the hon. member will agree that these remarks are not pertinent to this item.

Mr. Chevrier: There is nothing the matter with them at all. I rise on a point of order. There was absolutely nothing the matter and nothing contrary to the rules of the house in what the hon. member had to say concerning the Minister of Public Works, certainly nothing to compare with what the Minister of Public Works has been saying repeatedly about those of us who sit on this side of the house. I say to you with deference that the

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

hon. member has a perfect right to say what he has said. Surely the time has come in this house, Mr. Chairman, when we on this side ought to be able to say some things. After all, this afternoon we were given an example of nothing but complete obstruction on the part of hon. members on the other side of the house. All one has to do is to look at *Hansard* to see what happened last night. Those who sit on the other side of the house have continually interrupted every speech made from this side, the speech of the hon. member for Levis, and now the hon. member who has the floor is being interrupted because he makes passing reference to the Minister of Public Works, which I submit to you with deference is not contrary to the rules of the house.

Mr. Walker: What about the mirror?

The Chairman: Naturally the Chair deplores as much as anyone the interruptions that take place and I hope that there will be no more. There have been many interjections back and forth and I do not think it helps an intelligent study of this item. I think the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate will want to restrict his remarks to this item as he is trying to do.

Mr. Pickersgill: My reference, sir, was primarily to the head of the government. I am one of those old fashioned people who believe that the head of a government is responsible for everything that government does. That is what we understand to be the situation under our British system. He has to take the responsibility for everything that is done by his colleagues whom he keeps in his cabinet, and I do not envy him, sir, particularly in some cases.

One of his colleagues is the Minister of Labour who has the misfortune to be saddled with the responsibility for this bankrupt fund. It seems to me that when I suggest that the Prime Minister is gazing in a mirror, and not facing facts, that is perfectly normal, valid criticism, and I may say that I did not think even this thin-skinned government was quite that thin-skinned. What I am saying, sir, is that the government refused to face the problem. That made it necessary for the government to ask for this loan for the unemployment insurance fund, and they certainly are not doing the things they said they would do about this problem. The only reason this vote is before us, the only reason this loan is being sought is unemployment, persistent unemployment at an intolerable level, a level so high that, notwithstanding the very marked improvement in business activity, the Minister of Labour cannot derive very much satisfaction from reading the leading editorial in the *Financial Post* this