

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

seeing that departments did not permit other more urgent and more important business to cause this to be overlooked.

As I said a moment ago, this work has now reached the stage where I believe it is desirable that parliament should be informed of it and asked to approve of an appropriation as set forth in the estimates. When the estimates are discussed, fuller particulars can be given in this connection but within the limitations which security permits and demands.

I wish again to re-emphasize that the inclusion of a vote for this purpose does not in any way mean that war is more likely than before. But, as my hon. friend said, the tremendous changes that have taken place by way of technological advances in the last year, the launching of sputnik, the launching of intercontinental ballistic missiles and the like, may indeed have rendered that master plan of radar lines built during the period that my hon. friend was a minister not as effective as was the anticipation of those who made the plan.

Occupying as we do one of the most strategic positions in the world between the U.S.S.R. and the United States we must make every provision against those things which we believe to be improbable and which we hope will never come to pass: at the same time they cannot be left to the chance of the exigencies of the moment.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Will this mean the transfer of like ministerial responsibilities from present hands?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not going to go any further at this time. I know that my hon. friend, with his wide experience in this field, will realize why I do not want to go further at this time.

I come now to some of the particular matters referred to by my hon. friend. He said that the speech from the throne was inadequate in that it did not refer to certain matters including international matters and the like and what he called the economic recession. It is interesting to find that that expression never passed the lips of my hon. friend or those associated with him when they sat over here.

Mr. Pickersgill: We did not have one.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am not going to go back over the history but this is one thing on which my hon. friends are somewhat vulnerable. As I said at the beginning, I am not going to relive the days of the election campaign, but I have a book too of the speeches of my hon. friend. It is a tremendous volume.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Good speeches.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: My hon. friend did not participate. He spoke only seldom and his speeches were not always reported. The Leader of the Opposition did speak. He dealt today with certain questions. He dealt with trade and he built up a great picture. One could almost interpret from his words that deficit trading with the United States is beneficial to Canada. He says the solution of the problem is expansion of trade rather than diversion. I ask him this question. When did he first arrive at that formula, because it was when he and his party were in power that the deficit with the United States kept rising and rising to a position of \$1,300 million.

I am not going to be persuaded to get into political considerations today. My hon. friend had various advisers, at least so the press reported. Oh, my hon. friend did not have any advisers? Mr. Speaker, that takes a great load of responsibility off some shoulders. One of those mentioned in this connection, who is a very great Canadian and who was here in Ottawa during the month of December, is Bruce Hutchison, a very learned editor from Victoria and a great Canadian writer. In a recent issue of *Harper's* magazine—it is a very recent one because he starts off by saying:

For Americans, the results of Canada's recent elections are more ominous than most of them yet realize.

This illustrates how recent it is. Then, he goes on to discuss the question of trade and he says this:

Canada is the United States' largest foreign market. Unlike some other markets, it pays in hard cash. It has never borrowed a nickel from the American government. The Canadian deficit is insupportable for any length of time—the equivalent of an unthinkable American deficit of over \$10 billions in a single market.

Well, he is not a prejudiced witness. He says that deficit is unthinkable. My hon. friend says it is laudable, even beneficial. Again, I put on the brakes, because I am not going to get into a political argument. I will give you some of the figures in that connection merely for the purpose of keeping the record clear, not for the purpose of indulging in controversy. He said something today that struck me as a very unusual statement from the Leader of the Opposition because all these deficits were piled up, Canadian exports to the United States were going down and imports were going up creating a deficit of \$1,300 million as compared to \$500 million the year before, under the former administration. If I were in a controversial mood, I would ask what did he do about it.

They used to say that we must not take our stand because it will annoy. Today, my hon.