

# Diefenbaker Delivers Stinging Attack Against Liberals; Tells Commons They

From The Ottawa Bureau of The Globe and Mail  
OTTAWA—The following is the text of Prime Minister John Diefenbaker's speech in the House of Commons Tuesday afternoon on the motion to go into supply, the Liberal Party amendment and the Social Credit Party sub-amendment to that motion.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it is not for me today to get into the argument as between the honorable member for Trinity (Paul Hellyer) and the honorable member for York South (David Lewis), but as I listened to the honorable gentleman a moment ago I recalled an occasion in 1960 when he performed a feat which was never performed in this House before.

A speech appeared in the Ottawa Citizen in detail purporting to be what the honorable member for Trinity had said in the House of Commons, and he had not spoken at all. That was indeed an example that none of us, including the honorable member for York South, would ever want to emulate.

May I say that this afternoon I am going to review something of the situation as I see it based upon the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition (Lester Pearson), an amendment so general, so widespread, so obviously diffuse that one can only conclude that it was placed in such general terminology so that he would sidle away from the question of nuclear arms.

He was afraid to face that question. He spoke strongly, he spoke shrilly. He used the same expressions that he used back in 1957 and 1958, the same decayed platitudes, the same single concern, the same cry for office.

Mr. Speaker, the closer that Bob Winters looms, the louder speaks the Leader of the Opposition.

At the end of all these generalities, the mountain brought forth a mouse. The amendment simply states that for various reasons the Government does not have the confidence of the Canadian people.

There is not a single definite challenge. He did not dare challenge on the question of nuclear arms. He was afraid. The honorable member for Trinity says: "We have a leader who speaks with such directness; we have a leader who speaks with authority and definiteness."

A few weeks ago his leader was saying "no nuclear arms under any circumstances."

He cried out against the Government's defense policy and generalities. He referred to some of the general problems facing our country. He turned, he contradicted, he did violence to logic, and when he concluded he produced an amendment which he believed would have the effect of securing the support of other members of this House.

I am going to refer to one or two matters today. I am going to deal first with the general situation in so far as defense is concerned, and in order that there will be no misunderstanding I will simply what I said previously, underlining in every particular what I said on that occasion.

Before I do I think I should read in part an editorial in the Winnipeg Tribune which deals with this matter. It refers to the campaign that has been going on which has so many forms, the campaign bringing known nuclear advocates to Canada to brainwash the public, that encourages various people to become captive audiences.

There was the farewell visit of Gen. Norstad and then there were other statements that were made by other generals. I think it was Clementine who once said that "the business of defense is too serious for generals. It requires civilian control."

The editorial in the Tribune goes on to say with respect to what happened following the declaration that I made in 1959: "In the intervening period the whole military strategic and tactical situation has changed. But the military men and their spokesmen, just because they have the carriers they asked for four years ago, are now trying to pressure the Dominion Government into the ultimate decision in military planning. They think they must go the last mile."

Then, there are some words in between, and we find this: "... regardless of public or political opinion on this fateful question."

Then, I should like to refer to what I said on Jan. 25 when I outlined the policy agreed upon by this cabinet. I am going to read this and then I am going to summarize it. I quote from Page 3136 of Hansard for Jan. 25, 1963:

"Following SACREUR's (Supreme Allied Commander Europe) recommendation, as we saw the situation in 1959 and as I said earlier in my remarks, we undertook to equip our squadrons assigned to NATO for a strike-reconnaissance role, which role would include the mission of delivering nuclear weapons."

This was the basis, and everyman and woman in this Parliament knew that course was undertaken and understood. A program was approved and appropriated by Parliament. The second point was, and I quote: "Delivery of the F-104G has commenced, but the strike-reconnaissance role has been

placed under doubt by the recent Nassau declaration concerning nuclear arms, as well as other developments both technical and political in the defense field."

Well, I could pick up almost any newspaper in either the United States or Canada and indicate that that was the interpretation given, those were the views of the conclusions arrived at there when the two leaders got together.

I have before me the Christian Science Monitor. This represents a completely changed viewpoint. I quote:

"The United States wants its principal allies to submerge their own national defense in a collective defense, where, for example, General de Gaulle would merely be one among many and lose direct control of French defense. In present circumstances this unified defense quite simply means final control by the United States."

These are not the views of any Canadian newspaper, this is a statement made by a reputable newspaper whose editorials are quoted everywhere.

Mr. Hellyer: Will the Prime Minister permit a question?

Some members: Sit down.

Mr. Hellyer: Will the Prime Minister permit a question?

Some members: Sit down.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then again, in the same issue, this appears, "Allied Defense," and it sets out the change in United States strategy in this regard.

Mr. Hellyer: You are referring to strategic weapons, not tactical.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I come back again to my statement, which appeared in Hansard of January 25, and I quote: "It will be necessary, therefore, at this meeting in May, for Canada to give consideration to this matter, and we will, in co-operation with the nations of NATO, undertake a clarification of our role in defense plans and disposition. We are united in NATO. We have never and will never consent to Canada breaking any of her pledged words and undertakings."

I underline that. The allies do not like it. This partly because they do not want to yield up control of their own nuclear destiny—a sacrifice they know the United States is not prepared to make. And partly because they have strong bomb-bomb minorities who fear that American control in a crisis means control by the Pentagon, by men trained to think in terms of war, not peace.

I come back again to my statement which appeared in Hansard of Jan. 25, and I quote:

"It will be necessary, therefore, at this meeting in May for Canada to give consideration to this matter and we will, in co-operation with the nations of NATO, undertake a clarification of our role in NATO defense plans and disposition."

We are united in NATO. We have never and will never consent to Canada breaking any of her pledged words and undertakings.

It is at that meeting where there will be reviewed the entire collective defense policy, that we shall secure from the other member nations their views, and on the basis of that we will be in a position to make a decision, a consistent decision, first to maintain our undertakings and secondly to execute, if that be the view, the maintenance of our collective defense.

In the meantime the training of Canadian forces in the use of these weapons systems can continue.

Now, I say to the House of Commons this: After that meeting we shall bring this matter before Parliament clearly, definitely and finally. I want to make that clear. There is no suggestion of any underhand agreements being entered into.

I summarize now the views that I placed before the House on this question. First, with regard to bringing nuclear warheads on Canadian soil, we will continue to negotiate with the United States so that they will be readily available in case of need.

This means that our security will be assured while at the same time we will be doing nothing to increase the nuclear family. Secondly, in that reference I made to negotiation, there was no prejudice in that.

I referred to the fact that negotiations were being conducted. There was no secrecy about that. I did not go into the facts in any way because those negotiations, in so far as agreements are concerned in connection



Progressive Conservative MPs greet Prime Minister John Diefenbaker Tuesday as he enters the House of Commons for crucial debate. From left, Lawrence E. Kindt, Macleod, unidentified man back to camera; Mr. Diefenbaker; Jack

Horner, Acadia; Clifford Smallwood, Battle River-Camrose; Albert Horner, the Battlefords; Hugh Horner, Jasper-Edison; Rod Webb, Hastings-Frontenac. Jack and Hugh Horner are brothers and Albert Horner is their cousin.

real and Toronto as well as the United States deterrent force.

Well, we installed these Bomarcas and the decision to do so, as part of a ring to protect the nuclear strike force, was announced in September, 1958.

What about the changes in between? What is the position of these things today? On the one hand the Department of State says they will defend Montreal and Toronto, that they are effective today, but on the other hand, on January 31 it was reported that Defense Secretary McNamara suggested that Bomarc missile squadrons have only limited usefulness against manned bomber attacks.

Are they going to continue with them? Yes, they are going to continue them, and the reason given was because the United States Government has already paid for them. That does not sound as if their defensive properties are very high today simply because they have been paid for already.

Earlier, the defense secretary told the United States committee that a general review of United States military strength shows that the continental interceptor force is vulnerable because it has no modern protection against missile attacks. Intercontinental missile attack is the great danger today, and this is what I say.

While on the one hand the Department of State issued its statement, on the other hand, on the day after, the Secretary of Defense said the very opposite. He said: "Our principal concern in years ahead must be the danger of an intercontinental ballistic missile and submarine-launched missile attack."

Mr. Speaker, there is the story. I do not often quote from the Toronto Star but this is what the Toronto Star said on that occasion: "United States Contradicts Itself."

Some members: Hear, hear. Mr. Pickersgill: That sounds like the Government of Canada. Mr. Diefenbaker: There are three or four other points which can be analyzed in the same way. On this occasion I am going to restrain myself from again referring to the document in question, but I do say this without any reservation that the subsequent statement made by the United States Secretary of State added to the seriousness resulting from the earlier statement.

He said in effect that what I said was incorrect. Then he wound up and said that Canada of course has the right to decide. Certainly it has the right to decide, but in that subsequent statement over and over again there is reiterated a viewpoint

that is inconsistent with the relationship between allies.

There has been no criticism on our part of the United States on occasions when we might have done so. I can think of events which have taken place within the last year, but self-control is necessary and must be exercised as between nations. We might have spoken out. Mr. Speaker, I say no more about that statement issued by the State Department.

Without it there is no survival. But I cannot accept the fears of those who believe we must be subservient in order to be a good ally of any country in the world. Macdonald fought this battle. The great merchants in the City of Montreal in those days—not the French-Canadians—had their views on this subject, that after all Canada would be that much stronger if it were joined with the United States.

That was not Macdonald's view. That idea comes in with almost every generation. I say this, Mr. Speaker, we are influenced in this way every day in our country on radio, television and in the press. When the leader of the United States speaks, we get it in detail over our television. I should like to see more of an interchange in this regard so they would learn something about our country.

When I hear some saying that the fact that one dares to speak out will endanger Canada's economy, I wonder what the future of this country would be if those fears and those who are of little faith held office in our country.

I believe in co-operation, at the closest co-operation, but not in the absorption of our viewpoint by any other nation. I believe in the maintenance in spirit and in fact of Canada's identity, with the right to determine her own policy without extra-mural assistance in determining that policy.

Mr. Martin: We all agree with that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I now pass on to the next phase in connection with this amendment, Mr. Speaker. As we listened to the Leader of the Opposition he repeated the same old statements. I was reading some of the speeches he made in 1958. He has a mighty good memory; because he used the same words by reference before I conclude, then, right from the beginning.

He speaks of the degree to which Parliament has failed to act. He would lead the country to believe that we are responsible for this. Well, Mr. Speaker, I take up the order paper and look over the amount of legislation we have on it. Can we get anything through? I am not

speaking of the other parties now.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am speaking of those who openly boasted that they would hold up this House until finally we would not have supply and would have to go on to the country.

This is legislation necessary for Canada. With regard to the National Development Act they said that, subject to the proper criticism and examination, it is good legislation. Do they let it go through? They talk and talk; then they end up by denying its passage.

It has been the same story, Mr. Speaker, all down the line, and I am going to refer to it in some little detail. They say we should organize the business of the House.

A member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I hear one solitary voice, Mr. Speaker. We could organize the business of the House. We have placed the business before the House. Let us look at the legislation on the order paper.

How many measures are before the House? The number is 31. There is the measure respecting the National Economic Development Board, which is something that should have gone through; there is the measure with respect to the Freight Rates Reduction Act. We cannot even get that before the House. There are other measures here which are not of the same importance.

There is the motion of the Minister of Labor (Michael Starr) for the second reading of Bill No. C-70, to provide for the safety of persons employed in federal works; there is the measure respecting industrial change and manpower adjustment; the measure to amend the Export and Import Permits Act; the measure to amend the Industrial Development Bank Act; the resolution in connection with Canadian National Railways—and so I could go on.

There is measure after measure which waits. There is the measure to set up an Indian Claims Commission; to amend the National Productivity Council Act by providing for the appointment of additional members; and so on.

These are matters that we want to get through. In addition, we have several others to come, in which there will be reference before I conclude. What happens? They come in and spend almost an hour a day on questions. One of the most spectacular contributions to wit, humor and waste of the time of Parliament was that made by the Leader of the Opposition the other day when he rose and gave his condolences to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (George Hees) for the burning down of some building in Toronto.

Mr. Pearson: The George H. Hees building.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Leader of the Opposition, holding a responsible position, talks facetiously like that.

Mr. Martin: A fire is not a facetious thing.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Wasting the time of Parliament, that is what has been going on. How can we organize these things if they hold up everything?

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I could go down the whole list and indicate exactly what has happened in this regard. On January 21 I put before the House, not by way of dictation in any way, but simply the suggestion that we get on with the business, that we endeavor to extend the hours of sitting, that we arrive at a plan whereby we will be able to deal with such

matters as the bill to amend the provisions of the Railway Act, based on the recommendations of the MacPherson Royal Commission.

Mr. Pickersgill: It has not yet appeared.

Mr. Diefenbaker: ... a resolution arising out of the recommendations of the O'Leary Royal Commission on Publications, the amendment of the Unemployment Insurance Act following the report of the Gill committee.

Mr. Pickersgill: That has not appeared.

Mr. Starr: Well, let the others get through and these will appear, too.

Mr. Martin: When were the reports made?

Mr. Pearson: They are not on the order paper.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I sometimes wonder how that man is able to stand up with the guilty conscience he has. I am referring to the honorable member for Bonaville-Twillington (Mr. Pickersgill).

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: The Prime Minister has suggested that I have a guilty conscience. I would certainly have a guilty conscience if I were a member of the House.

Some members: Sit down.

Mr. Pickersgill: Of course, if I were a member of the House, I would not want to listen to me—I would have a guilty conscience. I would certainly have a guilty conscience if I were a member of the House.

When we said our trade was increasing, they said: Nothing of the kind. They painted a picture of ruin within when we are going to get this land. They do not speak legislative program before the House? It all depends. It all depends. The honorable gentleman says they do not hold up, prophecies? Have living costs That leads me to deal with the increased as they said they course which has been followed would?

by the official Opposition. They say: Why don't you get these things before the House? Honorable members heard the speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was part and parcel of that

unrelenting search for power. I cannot explain the attitude. Last June, last May, by their guerrilla tactics, they endangered the confidence of the people in Canada. They continued to do that throughout the campaign. They sabotaged public confidence. They sniped at national achievement. Why have they been pushing for an election since the opening day last fall? They have been pushing for it because they know that every day we are in office, with the rising impetus of our economy, the falsity of their arguments in the election is being proven.

I look down this chamber to my friends in the Social Credit Party. I am dealing with them. In a moment I shall be speaking about the NDP. I wonder what they must think of a leader who voted for an amendment proposed by the Social Credit Party in accordance with their beliefs, an amendment proposing debt-free money. When they were asked whether they believed in debt-free money they said: No, no—we do not believe in it.

As far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, the Liberals say: We are ready to merge with them, or, at least, to take them in. There is only one down there they do not want, according to the honorable member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon), and that is the honorable member for York South (Mr. Lewis). He is a Marxist, according to the honorable member for Davenport. The rest of them are all right.

Mr. Gordon: I would ask the Prime Minister to prove I ever said that. If he means by it the implication which sometimes goes with it, he is not telling the truth, and it is high time he did.

Mr. Lewis: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have the only legitimate question of privilege, and I want to inform the House, in the words of Karl Marx, that I deplore the word Marxist.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The honorable member for Davenport did not deplore it, according to the Canadian Press. He asked me to read the statement. I will give the exact words. This is the report which appeared in the press. I read from the Saskatchewan Star-Phoenix of January 14:

"The New Democratic members of Parliament range all the way from those who would easily assimilate Liberal theory ... except David Lewis, who is an out-and-out Marxist and who would never fit into our party."

Mr. Lewis: On a question of privilege, may I say that the last part of the report, namely that I would not fit into the ranks of the Liberal Party, is inaccurate. The first part is utterly false.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the honorable gentleman for answering the other honorable gentleman. I am going back over the arguments they used—the same arguments with which they undermined the confidence in this country. They said that as a result of our action in pegging the dollar, the dollar of the Canadian housewife would be worth 7½ cents less. They said the cost of every item of food, every article of clothing, every household requirement, would be increased. They said the cost of services would be increased. If they want proof, I have it.

They said—and they did this for political purposes—that we were ruined as a nation. They predicted searing inflation which would wipe out the savings of widows and pensioners. How did they support this? They offered counterfeit dollars to support a counterfeit charge in a counterfeit campaign. That is the hoax they almost succeeded in on June 18.

When we said our trade was increasing, they said: Nothing of the kind. They painted a picture of ruin within when we are going to get this land. They do not speak legislative program before the House? It all depends. It all depends. The honorable gentleman says they do not hold up, prophecies? Have living costs That leads me to deal with the increased as they said they course which has been followed would?

by the official Opposition. They say: Why don't you get these things before the House? Honorable members heard the speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was part and parcel of that

When we said our trade was increasing, they said: Nothing of the kind. They painted a picture of ruin within when we are going to get this land. They do not speak legislative program before the House? It all depends. It all depends. The honorable gentleman says they do not hold up, prophecies? Have living costs That leads me to deal with the increased as they said they course which has been followed would?

by the official Opposition. They say: Why don't you get these things before the House? Honorable members heard the speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was part and parcel of that

unrelenting search for power. I cannot explain the attitude. Last June, last May, by their guerrilla tactics, they endangered the confidence of the people in Canada. They continued to do that throughout the campaign. They sabotaged public confidence. They sniped at national achievement. Why have they been pushing for an election since the opening day last fall? They have been pushing for it because they know that every day we are in office, with the rising impetus of our economy, the falsity of their arguments in the election is being proven.

I look down this chamber to my friends in the Social Credit Party. I am dealing with them. In a moment I shall be speaking about the NDP. I wonder what they must think of a leader who voted for an amendment proposed by the Social Credit Party in accordance with their beliefs, an amendment proposing debt-free money. When they were asked whether they believed in debt-free money they said: No, no—we do not believe in it.

As far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, the Liberals say: We are ready to merge with them, or, at least, to take them in. There is only one down there they do not want, according to the honorable member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon), and that is the honorable member for York South (Mr. Lewis). He is a Marxist, according to the honorable member for Davenport. The rest of them are all right.

Mr. Gordon: I would ask the Prime Minister to prove I ever said that. If he means by it the implication which sometimes goes with it, he is not telling the truth, and it is high time he did.

Mr. Lewis: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have the only legitimate question of privilege, and I want to inform the House, in the words of Karl Marx, that I deplore the word Marxist.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The honorable member for Davenport did not deplore it, according to the Canadian Press. He asked me to read the statement. I will give the exact words. This is the report which appeared in the press. I read from the Saskatchewan Star-Phoenix of January 14:

"The New Democratic members of Parliament range all the way from those who would easily assimilate Liberal theory ... except David Lewis, who is an out-and-out Marxist and who would never fit into our party."

Mr. Lewis: On a question of privilege, may I say that the last part of the report, namely that I would not fit into the ranks of the Liberal Party, is inaccurate. The first part is utterly false.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the honorable gentleman for answering the other honorable gentleman. I am going back over the arguments they used—the same arguments with which they undermined the confidence in this country. They said that as a result of our action in pegging the dollar, the dollar of the Canadian housewife would be worth 7½ cents less. They said the cost of every item of food, every article of clothing, every household requirement, would be increased. They said the cost of services would be increased. If they want proof, I have it.

They said—and they did this for political purposes—that we were ruined as a nation. They predicted searing inflation which would wipe out the savings of widows and pensioners. How did they support this? They offered counterfeit dollars to support a counterfeit charge in a counterfeit campaign. That is the hoax they almost succeeded in on June 18.

When we said our trade was increasing, they said: Nothing of the kind. They painted a picture of ruin within when we are going to get this land. They do not speak legislative program before the House? It all depends. It all depends. The honorable gentleman says they do not hold up, prophecies? Have living costs That leads me to deal with the increased as they said they course which has been followed would?

by the official Opposition. They say: Why don't you get these things before the House? Honorable members heard the speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was part and parcel of that

When we said our trade was increasing, they said: Nothing of the kind. They painted a picture of ruin within when we are going to get this land. They do not speak legislative program before the House? It all depends. It all depends. The honorable gentleman says they do not hold up, prophecies? Have living costs That leads me to deal with the increased as they said they course which has been followed would?

by the official Opposition. They say: Why don't you get these things before the House? Honorable members heard the speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

It was part and parcel of that

Continued on Page Nine



# Boasted Party Would Let No Legislation Pass in Bid to Topple Government

● From Page Eight

pegged the dollar. We told them it would increase our export opportunities, substantially increase the revenue of the tourist industry and provide more opportunities for Canadian manufacturers to produce for the domestic market. They ridiculed, they ranted and they prevaricated. That is why they were so anxious to get an election in the fall—so that their campaign of falsehood would not be answered by the facts.

The increase in our gross national product? They said there was nothing to that. They reviewed the situation. We know today what the situation is, and in order that the record may be clear before this vote takes place I intend to put a few of the answers on the record. Who told the truth about the Canadian dollar?

Mr. Pickersgill: The minister of agriculture.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Honorable gentleman is so right. He does not say he did, or that anyone associated with him did.

Who told the truth about the Canadian economy? As I went across this country after the election two people said to me, "You told us that the economy was on the uprise, a great upsurge, and it was not true because you had this foreign exchange difficulty." They had it in 1948.

Mr. Pickersgill: In 1947.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right, 1947. They had the pegged dollar then at 10 per cent.

Mr. Pickersgill: You might as well have the facts right.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I was half way between. I said 1948. It started in 1947 and went through to 1949. Now, being face to face with them in the House of Commons, on the basis of what has taken place since then, I charge them with an offense and say they were guilty of one of the greatest election frauds in our history. I refer to all of them. They went across Canada. They put their greed for office before their needs expected of Canadian citizens. Now we are able to offer the facts. Do they quote the London Economist any more?

Some members: No.

Mr. Pearson: We should be glad to do so.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Even the honorable member for Bonaville-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) has not referred to it for some time. What does the London Economist say? In this year-end edition of December, 1962, it says this:

"Canada in 1962 outstripped every nation in the world in the rate of economic growth."

The honorable member for Davenport is not here at the moment.

A member: He is coming now.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad he is now here. May I say that we reached the present level three years ahead of the target date indicated by the Royal Commission headed by that honorable gentleman. I am placing the record before the House and the country and answering that campaign about which I shall say no more than I have already said.

Newsweek states as follows:

"World-wide industrial expansion is 7 per cent over last about year, with the United States about coming out of a recession. Canada registered the top gain."

What of these purveyors of doom and gloom? What of the statements they made before the Canadian people? What does Business Week say?

Mr. Pickersgill: The Minister of Justice in Tokyo said . . .

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, I know you ridicule anything with regard to Canada's economic growth and expansion. That is part and parcel of the Liberal attitude.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Some members: Oh, Oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: The Prime Minister has once more chosen to make a personal reference to me, suggesting that I was ridiculing something. All I was pointing out was that the Minister of Justice in Tokyo said we had the highest level of unemployment in the Western world.

Mr. Fleming (Minister of Justice): I rise on a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, This assertion has been made twice in the House. It was raised first of all by the leader of the Opposition. I said then that I never made any such statement and that a report to that effect appearing in one of the Tokyo papers was not true. The honorable member for Bonaville-Twillingate, notwithstanding that denial, came back and made the same statement in this House later. It was again denied. He is raising it again now. This is the plainest breach of the privileges of the House and I say to him that the repeated assertions of something that is not true what he is saying and what he is trying to do is dastardly and false.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, if the honorable member cannot understand that language, he cannot understand English. I mentioned Business Week which states as follows:

"Canada chalked up the highest growth rate of any Atlantic Community country."

Where are these people who walked about in sepulchral tones and talked about the awfulness of the Canadian economy? No wonder they want an election. Their sins are now finding them out.

The Mercantile Bank of Canada had this to say:

"Devaluation has provided a powerful force contributing to a better external balance, increased production and more employment."

I have only to look at the records as to Canada's foreign exchange position. It is of the best if not the best in all our history, according to the record in today's Globe and Mail. The Financial Post states:

"Canadian steel-makers (and may I say that steel is always indicative of an economy going up or down) are being hard-pressed to cope with the record load of orders for cold rolled steel sheets."

The Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce states:

"One of the main sources of strength as this year progresses has been the substantial rise in the volume of exports. . . . Personal incomes have continued to expand in the wake of increased employment opportunities, higher rates of pay, and levels of farm income."

Then Canadian Business had this to say: I do not like to put these things on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I know how honorable members opposite feel. They who predicted that the country was going into bankruptcy today are compelled to sit and to realize that their statements have no basis; and they knew they were false when they made them.

I mentioned the reserve. In today's paper The Canadian Press carries this report:

"Canadian reserves gained \$123,100,000 during January to a record \$2,662 million due to the receipt of \$125 million in U.S. dollars from a Government bond issue in New York last fall."

Then it goes on to say this:

"Still to be repaid from the reserves is \$300 millions borrowed from the International Monetary Fund by the Government last June when the reserves reached their low point of \$1.1 billion."

That has been the picture all the way along. Have they learned their lesson?

A member: They will never learn.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, they are at it again. The honorable member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon) was out West. He said, "Oh, things are gloomy ahead, as I see them." May I say that he did not see ahead very well. He said that our national production would not attain the present level until three years later. They are all starting at that same old dirge again. I think Mr. Winters joined in it the other day as well. I say this, Mr. Speaker, the same authors and the same spokesmen are abroad in the land again. The propaganda trumpets are being tuned for another doleful dirge on this nation's economy. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the people today know who told them the truth.

I could go into the questions of trade and agriculture. As far as trade is concerned, all of us know the tremendous expansion that is taking place. Every effort is being made to ensure that for the first time in the Department of Trade and Commerce we go out after trade in every part of the world.

Agriculture? All you have to do is ask the farmers: "What about your incomes?" What did coming out of a recession. Can the pegging of the dollar do ada registered the top gain."

You remember what honorable members opposite said. They said to the farmers: "You are going to lose your markets. This is a very serious situation. Prices are going to go down." That was repeated over and over again. Let me say this. We have extensive measures in mind under the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act, ARDA, which in the years ahead I believe will stand as a monument to the greatness of the contribution of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton), a charter for the development of rural communities and maximum utilization of the nation's land and resources.

I am not going into the question of social security except to say this. We cannot get anything through in this House because all the Official Opposition does is watch the clock to be sure nothing will pass within a reasonable length of time. That has been their attitude.

Let none of them say they have not been boasting about it



Social Credit Leader Robert Thompson, right, and Deputy Leader Real Caouette raise their arms and hold hands in triumph Tuesday night after their party had helped to defeat the minority Progressive Conservative Government in the House of Commons.

because during Christmas week the old propagandist for that party started to say to the press: "We will hold them up so they will not be able to get their estimates through. We will hold them up so they will not get any money and then they will have to go to the country." Then the individual in question, whom that shrug of the shoulders along with other movements identifies, went on to say: "They will not get anything through; they will not get their estimates through." That has been the attitude throughout.

Social security? We want to bring about an opportunity to have portable pensions under way in co-operation with the provinces. We want an opportunity in this House to bring in a program for a contributory old age security plan on the basis of survivor benefits. It cannot be done without an amendment to the constitution.

In view of the opposition of one of the provinces I feel that we should now give consideration to bringing about the adoption of such a plan without survivor benefits in order that we may carry out that which we have tried to, an improved and beneficent social security program under which you and I will contribute during our earning years up to a date when we become pensionable.

In addition, the honorable member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) asked: "What are your further plans?" I think that one problem that has to be met is the question of urban redevelopment by means of a program in that connection. That is something that affects almost every member of this House. The constituency of the honorable member for York-Scarborough (Mr. McGee) covers an area that was farmland when I was a boy and today it is settled with 250,000 people. There must be co-operation with the provinces. A plan must be worked out. We want the opportunity to present this kind of thing. We want to get the legislation on the order-paper passed.

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): And a lot more.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and, as the Minister of Justice says, a lot more. You say: "What would you do?" I ask you, what can we do but invoke closure and I shall never adopt closure because I remember the way the Official Opposition crucified them. If our hands are tied they are not tied by the other two parties but by the Official Opposition. They bear the responsibility. Oh, they can smile. The leader of the Opposition smirks . . .

Mr. Pearson: No, smiles.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —but at the same time he knows who it is that is holding up legislation. We put it before Parliament. They hold it up. We place before you our views on defense.

Member: Which ones?

Mr. Diefenbaker: We will bring in the new estimates—they are available—within a period of two weeks.

Mr. Nowlan: One week.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Within a period of one week.

Mr. Nowlan: They are available today but only in one language.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We will bring down a budget within four weeks or so, I think within four weeks.

Mr. Nowlan: By the last day of February or before.

Mr. Diefenbaker: By the end of February, I thought the Opposition wanted a budget. They do not want a budget, Mr. Speaker. They are afraid of what it will contain.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They do not want it. Oh, they will go to the people. Do you know what they thought I would do? They thought I would recommend dissolution and then they would say: They denied us a budget, they denied us the opportunity to pass legislation, they denied all those things. I have put it on their doorstep now.

I can understand their feeling. You know, they are conscience-stricken over what happened to the Canadian economy.

They are fearful of what will be in the budget, so they come along and challenge on the same old grounds and in the same old words, the same vocabulary that they used before we were in office a matter of a few weeks. They do not want a budget. They came up with the idea that we would use Governor-General's Warrants instead of supply. We are giving them the chance to prevent us placing the rest of our legislative program before the House, which is needed in every part

of this country. In addition to what we already have on the order paper.

The leader of the Opposition quoted Cromwell, or rather misquoted him. I say, using Cromwell's words: Do something to assure Canada legislation that we will pass with your assistance and which we cannot pass unless you co-operate.

Mr. Pearson: Who said that?

A member: Cromwell never heard of Canada.

Mr. Pearson: Jimmy Cromwell.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Do you want to frustrate our program? Certainly you do.

Do you want to prevent a budget? They want to prevent us, Mr. Speaker, from completing the National Development Act, and they have done so. We have been five years in office and development in all parts of the country has been greater than under any government in the same period. We want to complete the National Development Board Act. What good is it in its present form? What are we supposed to do? They say, why don't you organize? How can you organize to secure the consideration of something that the opposition is doing everything in its power to prevent being enacted? They have followed that course.

I want to see an examination of legislation. I want to see all the bills looked into carefully. If I do not want to take from Parliament the right to discuss any particular matter, but when you get the same repetitious nonsense during the discussion of all the bills that have been introduced you can only conclude that what is being done is for a purpose. They are going to vote non-confidence to prevent us bringing in this legislation, they say to prevent us bringing into effect something that has been requested over and over again, a feed policy for the eastern farmers; that is on the order paper today.

The following resolution will appear on the order paper, to introduce a measure to provide for the adequate supply of feed grain for livestock in Eastern Canada, for the establishment of an eastern livestock feed board; to provide for the making of assistance payments by the board in respect of the transportation, carrying and storage

of feed grains. My honorable friends over in the Social-Credit group have been asking for something like this. It is being placed on the order paper now, following a full examination that has taken place. Now, you are asked to vote it down; to say you do not want it. Well, that is what the Liberals want to achieve.

What about the western farmer? What about the two-price system and the distribution we have made over the years? Are you going to turn that down? This is what it amounts to if you vote non-confidence. You say to the western farmer and the western people that such a system should not be adopted.

We have other matters of legislation in the field of trade and commerce, and so on, to accelerate the economy. I do not come before you to ask for your support. I simply say this: If you vote against us in this house you are actually playing into the hands of the Official Opposition. What about the other two parties? What about Social Credit? Well, no part of our policy is determined elsewhere than by ourselves. Yesterday, you were cajoled and pampered by the leader of the Opposition. I never saw anybody smile with such a benign look in your direction. He loves them, but he loved you not until yesterday.

A member: We know that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, do you remember the stories they told of the Social Credit member immediately after the election? I am not going to put them on the record, but they had you as people who were going to Government House in order to get their car and chauffeur and some of you supposedly went to Quebec City in order to find your office in the Legislative Building. When I heard that stuff I said that was the same old song as they sang in 1922 regarding the Progressives. They told the same stories then, but at that time they did not have a chauffeur themselves. This was the attitude of the Liberal Party and has been their attitude throughout.

Do you remember the night of November 9 in this House when you were held up to contempt? No, they say join with us. What for? For your benefit? I say to my friends of the NDP,

greater love hath no man than the Leader of the Opposition for you today. When you line up to prevent this legislative program, you deny the budget for which you have been asking. I say to each and every one of you—I cannot speak to the unregenerate opposite because there is no hope of salvation for them—remember this group. I've seen them here often. This is the same bunch who trampled on the rights of Parliament day after day, who destroy any vestige of argument and refuse us even the opportunity to speak. Have they reformed? Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw the nature of their reform a few days before Christmas when, by organized disorder, they prevented me from speaking in this House.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the old question comes back, can the leopard change its spots? These are the facts. I place them before you as fairly as I can under the circumstances. They talk in the amendment about lack of leadership. I ask the leader of the Opposition, is it leadership that he is showing in preventing Parliament from dealing with these matters?

"Confusion," who used that word?

First he said "I don't believe in nuclear weapons." Then he went to New York and came back and said, yes. Then he went to his constituency and said, "I did not say yes. I was in favor of nuclear weapons. I would only have them until I am able to get an agreement not to have them."

Mr. Speaker, I ask this House for a vote of confidence, for the opportunity to do the things we want to do and have been denied the opportunity of doing. I have no appeals to make but I feel that the people of Canada want us to complete our legislative program, get our estimates through, and then all of us will be able to say to the people of Canada, "We received a mandate. It was an uncertain one." As the honorable member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) said, we are a House of minorities, but we carried out the mandate given to us.

We can only give the people a chance, but before we do that do not let us risk an election campaign now. The other day I saw the benefits of calling an

election, thinking only of the political consequences in our favor, but I asked, "What will its affect be on a rising economy in the years ahead and the months ahead, unless we get those things on the statute books that would continue the upsurge of the economy of Canada?" I now ask a vote of confidence from all honorable members in the House.

Some members: Hear, hear.

L. B. Pearson (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would not intervene again in this debate but for the remarks of the Prime Minister, so many of which were directed to me, and the remarks of the House leader last night, so many of which were directed to me personally challenging me to do this and challenging me to say that. So I feel I must accept the invitation given to me again this afternoon in such courteous tones by the Prime Minister, to state my views on certain matters which apparently he had not satisfied himself about in my previous intervention.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a passionate plea on the part of the Prime Minister for support from the opposition parties so that he may remain in power, so that he may remain in power not to complete the work but to begin the work that he promised to do.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: The Prime Minister and his friends accuse us of being arrogant for power when we do our duty as an opposition taking advantage of every legitimate opportunity to get rid of this Government which has done so little for the Canadian people. How are we to describe the plea of the Prime Minister speaking for a Government which has failed for five years and demanding that we give them another chance to bring their legislation before Parliament?

It reminds me of the story of the teen-age orphan who killed his mother and father with an axe and then pleaded for clemency from the judge on the ground that he was an orphan.

It was a plea for power and a plea for support from those sources which are necessary to the Prime Minister if he is not to be defeated this evening, and that is why he made this direct and definite appeal to the partisans to my left. Indeed he went so far as to murmur something, trying to challenge our right to address our remarks to all parts of the House, about greater love hath no man. This apparently was an attempt to undermine any appeal I might have made.

I do not recall making any great appeal. The members in the other parties will do what they think is right and best for the country, and we shall leave it at that.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: But I would like to adapt the Prime Minister's quotation of greater love, in view of the events of the last few days, to put it this way that perhaps greater love hath no man than to lay down his life for his life. I think, however, that the Prime Minister—who got a great deal of assistance from around him—and I am sure he appreciated it as I do on this side when I am privileged to receive it—should be given that kind of admiration and sympathy that is afforded to a surgeon who is conducting an operation for appendicitis on a table in the ship's galley of a plunging ship in the midst of a North Atlantic storm. He is certainly doing his best with the weapons at his disposal and in the circumstances which he finds.

This afternoon he made great play of the fact that all the rumors that have been spreading are put out by the propaganda machine of the Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, since when has the propaganda machine of the Liberal Party found its headquarters in this building in the office of a Conservative cabinet minister?

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: The Prime Minister went over the legislative proposals of the Government which he says only the Liberal Opposition are preventing from being put into effect. He exempted the other two Opposition parties from any charge or any criticism of this kind. He says: "Only give us a chance and we'll get all these things through."

One of the things he mentioned—and I will pick only on because I have not time to argue the falsity of the other arguments and illustrations that he brought forward . . .

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): Yes, have unlimited time.

Mr. Pearson: as one illustration of what they had been trying to do was the matter of portable pensions. He said, "We had only had a chance we could have got that measure through." Well, Mr. Speaker, that was in the Speech from the Throne. A national scheme of portable pensions, to which the party is committed, of course requires co-operation, and co-sultation and agreement with the provinces. When we ask the question the other day as to whether any steps had been taken to get in touch with the provinces in connection with this very important matter, which we asked for a return on that matter, we found that at the time the question was asked in a single communication in

gone to a single provincial government.

This is what we mean when we say this Government does not know how to conduct the business of Parliament and the business of the country.

Then he goes on to say, "over on the Opposition side they filibuster. They stand in the way. They obstruct. Everything would be through if it were not for them." He ignores the fact that, as I said yesterday, they rejected every opportunity but one to bring supply forward last autumn. And they kept Parliament from meeting until September 27. They have allowed only one supply day this session and we have had no request for interim supply even though the last interim supply was exhausted on February 1. Can they blame it on us if they managed their business that way?

So far as taking up time is concerned, the Prime Minister has made some very general accusations, in his normal way of making very general accusations, without supporting them with detailed evidence which will stand up under examination. Not the kind of evidence he brought forward the other day when he was quoting from a report of a statement which I made and from which he left out the word "not." I do not mean that kind of evidence; I mean evidence that will stand up under examination.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what is the record of this Parliament. It has already been stated this afternoon in reply to a question addressed to the Prime Minister by my honorable friend to my left that a good deal of legislation has been passed. More legislation has been passed this session than was passed in the last session, when the Government had 205 members. So that in itself does not bear out the accusations of complete obstruction. But who is doing the talking? Who are holding things up, if things are being held up? Who is responsible for exercising the time-honored right of members of parliament to discuss legislation and proposals before they go through? According to the Prime Minister the situation is, "Let us bring them in. Let us get them through. That is all that matters." He is so anxious to get things through this House that he will not even let us discuss \$200 million of taxation imposed by order in council. He will not even bring that matter before the House. That is really carrying efficiency to the maximum.

But in so far as those matters which have been brought before the House are concerned, what has happened?

With regard to the National Economic Development Board, a very important piece of legislation, on November 27, 28 and 29, five Liberals spoke, three Progressive Conservatives, four Social Crediters—four out of a party of 30—and three New Democratic Party members out of 19. On the Atlantic Development Board, a Government measure which had the support of the Government, which they now claim they wanted to get through at once and that we were holding it up, 17 Progressive Conservatives who felt it necessary—and I do not criticize them—to talk in favor of a measure which they already supported and which they were not going to change. Twenty-one Liberals spoke on that measure and put forward amendments to make it a better measure, and there were seven Social Crediters and 12 New Democratic Party spokesmen. When that bill went into committee there were 49 Progressive Conservative members who spoke on it without proposing any changes whatever, but who rose to their feet to say, "this is a wonderful bill. Let us get it through, so 49 of us will make speeches on it." On second reading, Mr. Speaker, there were four Liberals, five Progressive Conservatives, two Social Credit and three New Democratic Party spokesmen, and on the last day, November 20, the Conservatives had to filibuster their own bill in committee for an hour and a half because there was no other business ready for the House.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: My honorable

friend

Mr. Fleming (Eglington): That is not true.

Some members: Oh, oh.

# Impossible to Gain Intelligence From PM's Defense Policy Outline: Pearson

● From Page Nine

friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fleming) was, I think, in Japan and was not aware of what was going on here.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I was in Japan when the House was in recess.

Mr. Pearson: He may have been telling the Japanese people there was no unemployment in Canada. Then we had a supply motion, the only supply motion brought forward last autumn and this Government complains that they cannot get their estimates through, and they brought in one supply motion last autumn and introduced the estimates of one department of Government—

Mr. Churchill: Six.

Mr. Pearson: They introduced the estimates of one department of Government, the Department of Agriculture, for consideration, and most of the time in considering item No. 1 of those estimates was taken up by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton) himself filibustering his own estimates in order to explain what he really meant by something he said out West. It took him an hour to do it. Speaking on the supply motion on Nov. 5 and Nov. 6 the Conservatives spent 2 hours and 3 minutes speaking on it; the Liberals, 2 hours and 49 minutes, the Social Crediters 1 hour and 43 minutes—which is a pretty good percentage of the time—and the New Democratic Party 1 hour and 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go through the evidence because the Prime Minister made these vague and general statements and the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Churchill) made vague and general statements last evening. In view of this we will just look into the facts and try to get the truth, which is a very important thing to do in these situations. The budget resolutions last autumn took up eight days, including four short days, in committee of ways and means.

On those discussions—and they were very important discussions on the economic state of the nation—in the budget debate without a budget, as we called it, the Liberals spent six hours and 44 minutes analyzing the economy and the Government's proposals, if they had any, to deal with the state of the economy, the Social Credit Party spent six hours and 19 minutes; the Progressive Conservatives three hours and 36 minutes, and the New Democratic Party three hours and 49 minutes. With regard to the debate on the address, the Conservatives spent 14 hours and 31 minutes; and we spent 14 hours and 31 minutes. On the resolution in connection with the farm loan bill, a bill which was so important and so perfect that no change could be made to it, all we had to do was get it through the House at once, the Progressive Conservatives—that was a bill they were supporting and which they did not want to change—all they wanted to do was praise it, not change it—spent two hours and 48 minutes praising it, while it took the Liberals two hours and 26 minutes to try to make it a better bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record. That is the evidence to support the record. If, in the face of that record, the Prime Minister and his Government want to go to the country on the charge of obstruction, as they tried to do last June, that is perfectly all right with us.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pearson: The Prime Minister made great play this afternoon on the improvements in the economy and he produced evidence to support his statement that there has been an encouraging improvement in the economy in recent months.

The Prime Minister, of course, is following his usual practice of manufacturing straw men of enormous size so that they will be much more impressive when he knocks them down. He accused us last year of prophesying doom and gloom in the budget debate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Throughout the campaign.

Mr. Pearson: If the Prime Minister would bother to look at the speech I was able to make in a few hours which remained after the budget before dissolution, he will find that my criticism at that time of the Minister of Finance, now the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fleming), was that he had been a little too pessimistic in his calculations with respect to the economy during the current year. We thought it would be rather better than the prediction the Minister of Finance had made.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): You cannot support that.

Mr. Pearson: The Prime Minister has talked about greed for office. I would remind the right honorable gentleman that his Government, in its determination to call an election at a time they thought it would be best for them in order to hold on to office—and I am not complaining about that—called an election a year ago one year before they needed to do so. They called that election without the budget having been discussed. They called that election knowing a financial crisis was approaching, and the evidence which has been submitted to Parliament this session proves this to have been so beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That statement is false.

Mr. Pearson: They called an election in these circumstances hoping they could get through it before the financial crisis occurred in a way which would require devaluation of the dollar during the election period. Unfortunately, the Government's calculations were wrong. The financial crisis developed more quickly than they had hoped and they had to devalue the dollar under pressure in the middle of an election, in crisis conditions. In spite of devaluation the financial crisis got worse and worse until we reached the situation which confronted the Government the day after election. What did they do then to get Canada out of that really critical difficulty? They went down to Washington and saw those people in Washington and New York. They sent their experts across the border to say: We are in trouble. Will you help us out to the extent of one billion United States dollars?

The Prime Minister had a good deal to say about defense. He was somewhat harsh with me because I had not said anything on defense in my statement yesterday, although I did, I believe, spend some 25 or 30 minutes on the subject of defense, using it as an illustration in support of the amendment we were moving that the Government, as a result of its indecisive, weak and contradictory policies, is incapable of handling the nation's business. Defense was a good illustration of that contention. But the Prime Minister wants some more categorical statements from this side as to our defense policy even though he, as the head of a Government, refuses to tell us what his defense policy is. There seems to be no way at all by which we can force this Government to undertake its primary responsibility of telling this House and the people what exactly its policy is in national defense at the present time. They just will not do it. They are drifting along hoping for the best and hoping they can continue to drift until after the day of the election—and that is not going to be far ahead now.

This afternoon the Prime Minister did not have anybody else to clarify or interpret his remarks, so he attempted to do that himself. He attempted to clarify—I think the word he used was simplify—his earlier stand.

His earlier stand certainly needs both simplification and clarification. But I defy anyone to get either simplification or clarification or, indeed, intelligence from the Prime Minister's statement today as to what the defense policy of this Government is. He rambled around a good deal. He at-



Mr. Pearson: A confident smile.

—CP Wirephoto.

tempted to throw some light into dark corners. But he did not succeed in any way, shape or form in reconciling the differences which are now out in the open and obvious between himself and the former minister of national defense.

Those differences were made very clear last night by the minister when he appeared before a television press conference. I may add that the stand taken by the former minister last night can hardly be attributed to the Liberal propaganda machine.

Then, apparently in an attempt to justify his own position in this matter, whatever that may be, the Prime Minister struck a blow for civilian control of defense policy. It should not be necessary to re-

peat in this House or in any democratic assembly in a sovereign state that civilian control of military and defense policy is essential. It has been so in our country. It will continue to be so as well as, I hope, in all free countries.

As the Prime Minister said this afternoon—I think I am quoting him correctly—the business of defense is too serious to be left to the generals. Presumably it requires civilians. But the former minister of national defense had something to say about that last night in his television broadcast. He indicated that the business of defense is also too serious to be left to people who do not know anything about it and who are not experts in it.

Then the Prime Minister, in order to justify this Government's policy of drift and delay

which has been going on for so long in defense, now repeats what he tried to convince us was the situation a week of so ago, namely, that there have been two recent developments which require further delay. He referred this afternoon, once again, to the NATO Council meeting in Ottawa in May—and we shall be very glad indeed to welcome that NATO Council to Ottawa in May—and the Nassau declaration, the declaration by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. Our Prime Minister said this afternoon once again that this declaration places our role in NATO and in continental defense in some doubt—that it may be changed. It is strange indeed that one of the parties to that declaration, the United States itself, denies that any such result will flow from that declaration. I should not have to say anything more about this, because the Minister of National Defense took that view last night and he ought to know.

So far as the later meeting is concerned, are we now in a position in this country when the re-examination, reconsideration and renegotiation, if you like, of our defense policy is to be made in May of 1963 at a NATO Council meeting in Ottawa without this Parliament knowing anything at all about the proposals the Government is placing before that council?

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, this is a momentous debate in what may be the dying hours of this Parliament. We have listened this afternoon to statements both by the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Pearson) and I have no intention of getting into this controversy of the pot calling the kettle black. I have always felt that to be led down the garden path by either a Liberal or a Conservative would add nothing to one's pristine purity. In a no-confidence motion a party with a small representation in this House naturally faces certain difficulties, because while we may not approve of the Government, on the other hand a vote against the Government would be interpreted in some quarters as being in support of the Official Opposition.

A member: Heaven forbid. Mr. Douglas: A group like ours has considerable difficulty, of course, in getting its views before the public because if there is one thing the Prime Minister said this afternoon with which I agree, it is the fact that in recent weeks the press, radio and television of this country have certainly been playing a song closely akin to the desires and wishes of the Liberal Party in Canada.

Some members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas: The points of view expressed by other groups have, in many cases, been very successfully silenced. We in this group ever since June 18 last have refused to take a destructive attitude with reference to public affairs. Even before this Parliament was convened the leader of the Opposition was calling upon all the groups to pledge themselves to voting no confidence in the Government.

Some members: Shame.

Mr. Douglas: Even before Parliament had met. . . .

Mr. McCleave: Irresponsible.

Mr. Douglas: — every newspaper, every radio and television station was telephoning members-elect and asking them what they were going to do about turning the Government out. The members of this group made it abundantly clear before Parliament met and after it assembled that we were not here just to turn the Government out; that we were here to support any legislation which in our opinion would grapple successfully with the national and international problems confronting Canada. We recognized then, as we do now, that Canada faces a serious situation.

As to the international monetary exchange crisis of last June, let me say that in spite of the Prime Minister's optimistic statement this afternoon I am not convinced it has entirely disappeared. There is the subject of economic growth and unemployment. There are the difficulties facing agriculture; the fact that we lag far behind other countries in health and welfare programs. There is the need for trade policies in the light of changing trade patterns throughout the world. We said that all these things demand aggressive action and dynamic leadership. We said we were prepared to support the Government if they produced those things and that we would vote against them if they failed to do so. Our votes have not been motivated either by a desire to get the Government out, or, God forbid, by a desire to get the Liberals in.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Parliament, having sat since Sept. 27, because of the indecisiveness of the Government and also, I think, as a result of a good deal of obstruction by the Official Opposition, this Parliament has been reduced to a state of such impotence that the only answer now is to give the people of Canada an opportunity to go to the polls.

Let me just mention a few things we had hoped might be done during this session. We had hoped the Government would grapple with the need to plan



Mr. Diefenbaker: Defeated.

—CP Wirephoto.

this nation's economy. I do not need to elaborate on that subject because, fortunately, in the last 12 months everyone has apparently become converted to the idea of economic planning.

But all we have had to date from the Government is the prospect of four boards, composed, for the most part, of part-time members meeting periodically in Ottawa; four boards reporting to four separate ministers without machinery for co-ordinating their efforts or their plans. In many cases their terms of reference overlap and, above all, no provision has been made for a national economic development fund without which these four boards are simply groups of men holding little meetings in the corner.

We are still faced with serious unemployment. The Prime Minister talked this afternoon about the growth in the Gross National Product but the fact remains that this growth has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in employment. Unemployment continues to be a source of serious anxiety. The Speech from the Throne talks about providing 1,000,000 jobs over five years. I have not seen anything.

In legislation which indicates how these million jobs are to be created, and if we do create them this would only take care of the young people leaving our universities, schools and techni-

cal colleges to enter the labor market during that five-year period. We should still have to make provision for the half-million or so who are presently unemployed in addition to those who are displaced as a result of modern technology and automation.

The matter of trade is to the fore. I am convinced that Britain's application to the European Common Market having been rejected, this country will find itself facing circumstances whose difficulty we have not yet begun fully to appreciate.

I would have expected that during the past four or five months the Government would have put forward some idea about the development of our trading program in the light of such events as the emergence of the European Common Market, the United States trade expansion legislation in order that Canada, one of the great exporting nations, might have some part in this trade revival and this changing trade pattern all over the world. But we have had no statement other than that there is to be a ministerial meeting of GATT.

The subject of medicare is to the fore in every province in Canada. The Government announced the appointment in December, 1960, and we are told the commission is to report some time in June or July of this year. That is a long period of inaction. As a matter of fact, since the provision of health services lies within provincial jurisdiction the Federal Government had all the information it needed in order to pass the kind of enabling legislation which would enable Parliament to pay sums of money to any province which wanted to set up a medical care insurance plan, and leave it to the individual province concerned to determine the conditions and the type of plan it was ready to offer.

I submit the appointment of the commission has been merely a stall to avoid the necessity of facing this issue.

Action is needed with regard to agriculture. We have been told this afternoon that the eastern farmers are to have feed grain. We are told there is to be a two-price system for wheat. These proposals are certainly not before us at the present time and nothing has been suggested as a remedy for one of the main complaints of agriculturalists in this country, namely that all across Canada farmers of every kind find costs increasing while, on the average, the prices they receive are going down.

I see your honor getting a little restless and I would therefore suggest we call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.