

Natural Resources—Development

Mr. Diefenbaker: If Your Honour did I have not seen it, and I have looked all the way through here.

Mr. Speaker: I am talking about the session of 1953-54, but as to the motion to which he refers, and about which I did not say anything in my earlier remarks, I indicated that I had had some conversations with some hon. members and had pointed out that the amendment embraced about six notices of motion already on the order paper. As a matter of fact, during the debate on the amendment to the motion to go into supply there were discussions on power developments in the maritimes and other projects.

There is one thing more I should like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition. One cannot divorce the speech that he makes from his amendment. The Leader of the Opposition has spoken in a much wider manner than is covered by the amendment with which he concluded, but from the point of view of relevancy I have to take into account the speech he has made in allowing other members to address themselves to the amendment. As I say, I consider an amendment to the motion to go into supply as being an opposition motion and there are bound to be some difficulties later on. It is up to hon. members.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, if there is no further discussion on the point of order I should like to comment on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. First of all, may I say that I agree it will be a good thing for the Prime Minister to go to Bermuda and meet with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister met the President of the United States and had a chat with him and I imagine he will have the same sort of chat with Mr. Macmillan.

I would have liked to pursue international affairs further because I feel that at this time some expression of opinion should be made regarding matters coming before the United Nations tomorrow and particularly with regard to Canada's attitude toward some of the questions that will arise there. But I do not think I should do that. I think I should confine myself to the amendment already moved. I quite agree with what you have said, Mr. Speaker, that there is a danger not to the government but to the members of the opposition parties in moving omnibus resolutions. I know that from time to time in the past, on the address particularly and sometimes on the budget, we ourselves have been tempted to include four or five different matters in the amendment. The result has been that when something

extremely important came up with regard to one of the matters to which we had referred on the amendment on the address, we have been precluded from doing something about it later in the session. I think it is very good of you, Mr. Speaker, to remind the house, and particularly those of us on the opposition side, of the dangers of moving omnibus resolutions in connection with going into supply, or on the address or on the budget.

We are most decidedly in favour of the government's adopting a national development policy for Canada. We have always been in favour of such a policy. Indeed, it is implicit in our philosophy of how the development of the Canadian economy should be proceeded with. We have always believed that the country should have some sort of plan in accordance with which it might move, a plan that would enable the people of Canada to guide the development of their resources in the interests of the people of Canada so that the results of these great productive enterprises and the development of our great resources might be available to all our people rather than be concentrated in the returns on investments by persons who invest their money in the great private industries and corporations; that our farmers and our workers, our old age pensioners and our children should benefit to the maximum extent that it is possible to do from the development of these resources which have been placed so abundantly in this country by Providence over the ages. Hence we are in favour of a national development policy for Canada.

When we look over the history of this country since it was settled, I was going to say, or more particularly since confederation, what do we find? Until I came down here this afternoon or shortly before then, I was unaware of the fact that an amendment was going to be moved. I did not know what the amendment was or its terms when I came into the house this afternoon. However, I have in my hand a statement that was made in 1879, twelve years after confederation, by Sir Leonard Tilley. Speaking in this chamber at that time he said this:

I am not, I think, over-sanguine when I say, that the day is not far distant when the population in the western country will be greater than in Canada—

By that of course he meant in Upper and Lower Canada, now Ontario and Quebec.

—and when the maritime provinces, with their coal, iron and water power, will be the manufacturing centres for this vast dominion.

But what actually happened was that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built and the vast areas of the west were opened up

[Mr. Speaker.]