

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

Sir, I am not going to go back over the last session of parliament. There were a number of things buried under the debris. Now we have mention again of the Quebec Savings Banks Act and our old friend, a Canada Development Corporation. It was put in a state of suspended animation that was generally regarded as death itself, and now it does not even get a separate paragraph. It is put in among other things and the throne speech says it will:

—assist in financing major new industrial development and in increasing Canadian ownership of business corporations.

What has happened? With all the tinkering the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) has done, the amount of U.S. investment in Canada increased in the last year. While he raises his hand, Canute fashion, and says no, the other member of the family, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Drury), says yes.

Finally mention is made that there is going to be legislation on pension plans, and there are some further items, again buried together in an omnibus section. There is nothing in the whole picture to assure economic growth.

I read with interest what the Prime Minister said in *Weekend* magazine in that "no holds barred" interview on April 3.

I think it is the responsibility of government to assist this process—

That is the process of Canadian ownership, as I understand it.

—by making it attractive for Canadians to own their own country by giving them certain tax and other incentives. This is a better way of doing it than penalizing those foreigners who have established themselves here.

Why didn't the Prime Minister tell the Minister of Finance that two years ago?

Mr. Nowlan: A year ago.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Have they both learned since? Sir, that is what we have been arguing, and in the no holds barred interview the Prime Minister admits this is the way. Then he said:

A carrot is better than a kick in this respect.

Apparently the doctrine of the kicker, the Minister of Finance, is now to be supplanted by the doctrine of the carrot, by the Minister of Industry.

There are many other matters to be dealt with in connection with the subject of the economy but I intend to leave them for other speakers. I am simply pointing out that when one looks at this speech from the throne and sees the lineup of matters to be dealt with, it has the impressiveness of length,

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

volume and diversity of legislative enactments to be, but when analysed it is, as I feel you will agree, simply a document to act as a guide, compass or chart in an election campaign as to what would have been:

For of all sad words of tongue or pen,

The saddest are these: "It might have been!"

• (4:20 p.m.)

That is what they will say—"If only we had had the opportunity". The constitution is important. Unity is important. Economic development in all its phases from industry to agriculture, is important. But, sir, we will not have a great Canada if our nation in its parliament does not stand for high principles in high places and in all places. I look this over. While wars on poverty are essential—I assume the government borrowed that expression from the late President of the United States; look at the legislative program which followed in that country; very little was actually brought about—while wars on poverty are essential, they will be won when we raise economic standards in our nation, when the humblest in the land is not forgotten but has a voice in parliament. Fifty million dollars is going to the big manufacturers of automobiles and parts. But when anybody suggested that \$75 was too little for the old age pensioners, the government said wait. Fifty million dollars for the manufacturers but no addition for the old age pensioners.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What is conspicuously absent from this speech? Mr. Speaker, the moral things of a nation are greater than the material ones. It defies nature to think that a pure stream can run from a tarnished spring. The most conspicuous absence from the speech from the throne is this—a war on wrongdoing in high places.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not doubt that the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) would have taken his sword Excalibur and gone forth. Instead, there has been silence on an issue which has shaken the fabric of this nation. I had expected that even though this government has been fumbling and careless and inept there would have been in clear and definite terms a declaration by the Prime Minister as custodian of the national conscience that they would purge the unfit, the incompetent; that they would raise the standard of high ethics in this land. Nothing of the kind is to be found in this speech. How-