

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

Having regard to the experience we have had in by-elections, I can only say that our personal experience in days past was that we won the by-elections but when we came to the general elections we were not so successful.

I was quite interested in the dissertation of the Leader of the Opposition regarding the cabinet, my colleagues surrounding me, and his horror at the fact that he had read some place that there was division amongst us. Well, as I look at my colleagues and down this front bench I do not see any changes since 1957. I can only say that the exaggeration that was given to recent incidents had no basis in fact and that the unity among us is, as always, strong and I know, most effective.

In any event, and I cannot quote from the work of the hon. member for Bonaville-Twillington because he has not got that far yet, I will be interested in finding out what is said with regard to November, 1944 in the treatise on Mr. Mackenzie King when that particular period is dealt with. I hope that those of us who know the facts as they were will find the truth set out in the volume in question, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that we in this party have never had anything like the manner in which that great Canadian patriot, Ralston, was treated in 1944 at the time he was pushed out of the cabinet.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Better tell us about Mr. Stevens too.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Well, as soon as the hon. gentleman is hurt you hear from him. I intend to make some general references to the speech from the throne now. Without exaggeration, I think that the Leader of the Opposition today put both feet down with boldness and imagination and on both sides of several questions. He was short on facts and long on adjectives. I am not going to follow him in his adjectival self-delusions. However, I will say this. I am going to try this evening to unravel, if I can, some of the knots of absurdity and incongruity. This speech was not one which was equal to the efforts he has made in the past. I was somewhat disappointed in it in some particulars. He was dealing with many of the things he has said over and over again from one end of Canada to the other.

He stayed away from the speech from the throne, except to make a general reference to it. This general reference did not betray the knowledge of British constitutional practice and the difference between that practice and the practice in the United States that I would have expected. After all, he had experience

in Washington. He endeavoured to compare the speech from the throne to the state of the union speech delivered by the President of the United States. There is no similarity whatever. He criticized the speech from the throne in that it did not have, and I borrow these words from the hon. gentleman, "bold and imaginative words." I have heard that statement over and over again, and I intend to deal with some of these bold and imaginative stands.

I have before me the Queen's speech given in the United Kingdom on October 31. I find that it is approximately four columns in length. It refers in a very matter of fact manner to some of these questions with which we are dealing here. It starts off by referring to the visits of the Queen; the welcome to the United Kingdom of the president of Indonesia; the support of the government of the United Kingdom for the United Nations; the improvement of relations between east and west, which remains the primary object of the government's policy; discusses negotiations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; refers to the Geneva conference on Laos; refers to South Africa and the change in the relationship. Then, concerning the European trade question, it says the government will make every effort to bring those negotiations to a successful conclusion. There is a reference to certain legislation that will be introduced, and then the speech contains an omnibus section at the end to the effect that other measures will be laid before the house in due course.

This is the style that speeches from the throne have followed throughout the years in the parliament of Canada. This is not an exhortation, as is the state of the union address in the United States, to a congress that is removed from the president. This is simply a statement of the bill of fare which is to be brought before parliament.

I am going to make one or two references in general to the speech from the throne, and mention that it deals with the international situation. I do not know what we are expected to do other than put the facts before the House of Commons. Mention is made of the recommendations to work out some of the purposes of confederation and identify more clearly the Canadian nationality. Mention is made of the royal commission on publications and also of the constitutional conference which was held with representatives of the various provinces.

Then there is the question of redistribution, and I noticed the hon. gentleman stayed away from that. He made no reference to the fact that this provision would remove politics from redistribution, and I think it must have been a guilty conscience that caused him to