

The Address—Mr. Pearson

and a board or commission here or there, this speech is a rehash of last year's budget and the last election campaign statements. I do not know how anyone can get any hope of a change in the heart and mind of the government from that kind of speech from the throne.

Early this year the government produced another throne speech. Hon. members ought to read it. They will find a lot of this one in it. In those days, Mr. Speaker, this government had a very massive majority in this house, but they got very little done before they dissolved parliament.

An hon. Member: You were the reason.

Mr. Pearson: The reason they gave for not getting very much done was that they had been obstructed by a minority.

Mr. Chevrier: Forty nine people.

Mr. Pearson: They had 204 and I think we had 49 or 50; but we prevented them doing the things they meant to do. Now they have 116 and the combined opposition is 140 or 150; but they feel sure they can do the things now that they could not do with that great majority. They say, "It is easy now we are in a minority". Obstruction will not matter now. It does not matter that they can be out-voted. They did not do very much to implement the last throne speech, and I do not think we can have very much confidence in the present one.

The third and fourth parties said: we must wait and see; we must wait and see what the government has to propose in the speech from the throne. It may be, they said, it will have some promise of action in it such as would entitle us to declare confidence in this government. Well, they have waited and they have seen, and they have seen what I believed they would see and what I suspect they knew themselves they would see. They have seen a government which is incapable of important new initiative—a government incapable of undertaking new projects; a government pressed by so many conflicting interests that it takes refuge in indecision. Oh, it will do a bit more of some things and a bit less of others, set up councils and repeat the same old stuff. But what is there in this program, in the speech from the throne, which answers the criticisms made by all the opposition parties of this government, criticisms which were on June 18 supported by 63 per cent of the electorate? This program, I repeat, is made up of Tory leftovers from the last parliament.

If you had no confidence in the government in the last parliament, how can you have any confidence in this government now? Is this a parliamentary situation to make you change

your minds? Is this a program to make you change your minds? I do not envy any member of the opposition who has to go to the country to explain why he has now decided that this government which he so recently criticized so strongly has suddenly become a government which should be kept in office. Surely, no one who understands our national problems could vote confidence in this government. The financial editor of the *Montreal Gazette*, an unimpeachable authority, wrote on August 29—this was after the election:

The government's credits of domestic and international good will are alike just exhausted. It will have to be very convincing in both the scope of its programs and in its determination to see them through to retain its mandate.

I suggest that this government has been convincing in neither the scope of its programs nor in its determination to see anything through, and I hope I have given enough evidence to show why we on this side have no confidence in this administration and why we feel it is not only our duty but our privilege to move a vote of no confidence so that this house may decide whether it wishes the government to carry on or whether it wishes the people to be given a chance to put into office a government which will know how to carry on.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Chevrier) that the following be added to the address:

We respectfully affirm to Your Excellency that Your Excellency's advisers do not possess the confidence of this house.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, naturally at ten minutes to ten it will be difficult to answer the many issues that were covered in that wide ranging speech. Indeed, there were times during the progress of it when I felt that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) was in the position of Wellington at Waterloo: "Give me night, give me Blucher". As he watched the clock one could only conclude that his purpose, as was the case this afternoon—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: —was to make sure that there would be no opportunity for any answer to be given. And out of that volume of words and that wide range of discussion it is of interest to note that the only reference he made to agriculture was a number of passing allusions to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton) in a derogatory way. I saw the Leader of the Opposition on election night, Mr. Speaker, when he believed he was going to be occupying this seat. That is before the