

The Budget—Mr. Walker

any royal commission; they want to investigate nothing; they want to get this thing under way at the present time.

I could go on and deal with old age pensions. The Liberal rally approved an increase in those pensions, and yet one of the last things Walter Harris did in March, 1957, and I quote from page 2222 of *Hansard*, was this, he expressed the Liberal government's approval of the addition of a mere \$6 to the then monthly payment of \$40 by saying:

We are happy to be able to improve old age security payments.

Hon. members know what happened.

To dispose of Canadian agricultural surpluses the rally recommended that support be given to the establishment of a world food bank. At the NATO council meeting in Paris on December 16, 1957 the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) made that suggestion. That is more than three years ago, and he reiterated it just a few months ago in probably the greatest speech ever made at the United Nations in reply to Mr. Khrushchev.

The Liberal rally adopted a resolution to cut personal income taxes "during the present unemployment emergency" and to increase immediately the spending money available. Now to cut it even slightly would result in a reduction of \$500 million in government revenue. They advocated the cutting of the income tax and at the same time they adopted resolutions having to do with health insurance, increased pensions, increased vocational training and an increased public works program as well as increased urban redevelopment. They advocated measures and policies which, if inaugurated, would cost the Canadian taxpayers anywhere from \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion. It is almost impossible to work it out.

An hon. Member: A year.

Mr. Walker: Quite right, a year. I appreciate that addition; it is a very helpful one.

The main thing is that they are going to cut down our income tax. What is the total income tax collection in Canada in one year? It is approximately \$1.6 billion, and yet they are going to add \$1.5 billion to federal expenditures. In other words, what they have suggested is that the net additional costs of the proposals put forward at the rally would call for higher taxation equivalent to double the present income tax. What do you think of that, Mr. Speaker? Do we wish our income tax doubled? Emerson wrote—I do not necessarily agree with him:

Who dares think one thing and another tell, my heart detests him like the gates of hell.

I do not apply this to the Liberals at all, but I am respectfully suggesting—and it is

very seldom that I am as respectful as I am tonight—that never in Canadian history was there a more shameless vote-catching exhibition than that in which the Leader of the Opposition indulged. I might expect it from the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. This Liberal rally was in reality a study in vote-catching.

I should like to touch on the question of unemployment. Nobody can overestimate the seriousness of this problem. I know it, and we all know it. I worry about it. We all hate to see people unhappy, particularly wives and children. We hate to see the demoralizing effect of unemployment on the poor unfortunate person who is unemployed. Let me say quite frankly, this situation is going to be worse before it is better. The hon. member for Peterborough will appreciate this as well. What I say is that it is no consolation for us to point out that under Liberal regimes in the past we have had very high unemployment figures. This is only playing politics on either side of the house. We know it is a serious problem and we know we must do our best to solve it. Also, it is no consolation to say that the figures in the United States are enormously high at the present time. That is no consolation. But perhaps the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier) will not mind my pointing out to him that some of the figures that he slipped in this afternoon—and I did not see them until afterwards—were figures for only the first 11 months of the year. He forgot to tell us that. Perhaps he does not read the *Globe and Mail*. I have here an Associated Press dispatch from Washington which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of January 23 and which reads in part as follows:

Labour Secretary Arthur Goldberg estimated the current number of unemployed at 5,500,000—

Not 4.5 million as has been bruited about.—up one million from the reported mid-December total.

The total number of United States unemployed is 5.5 million. The labour force of the United States is 70.5 million and with 5.5 million unemployed in that country the percentage of unemployed is 7.8. Comparisons are difficult, Mr. Speaker. In the United States their armed forces have drained off the labour market 2½ million young men. We have 120,000 in our armed forces. So you can see how difficult it is to compare these figures. Suppose even a part of the 2½ million who are in the armed forces of the United States were on the labour market at the present time. What a tremendous change that would make in the percentage figures.

Again, is it fair to compare our figures of 528,000 at this season of the year in Canada,