

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

finance of that party, himself, advocated the pegging of the dollar several years ago, yet all through the 1962 campaign they dealt with arguments that they knew were baseless. This policy elevated the Canadian economy to the plateau it achieved. I ask them, then, are they going to remove the peg?

We introduced surcharges in order to meet a situation similar to the one which had occurred in 1947 when the economy was expanding. They criticized us for removing all these surcharges on March 31. We undertook to remove them as soon as it would be proper to do so, and that was the end of the fiscal year. We removed them, and thereby brought to our country new confidence in financial circles in every part of the world.

Now, sir, what about the halcyon days of 1956, the last year they were in office? Well, the gross national production has gone up 32.74 per cent since; labour income 36.7 per cent; personal income 40.7 per cent. During our period in office we were able to keep in check inflation which is the thief of economic progress. I am not going to go farther into that because other hon. members will deal with other phases. However, I should like to point out that only a couple of days ago the Canadian National Railways reported that their financial position showed improvement by \$18.2 million over the previous year and that Canadian National operating revenues were up \$28 million over 1961. Sir, we left the Canadian house in good economic order.

In this party we have, throughout the years, from its beginnings advocated the need for maintaining and preserving Canada's integrity as a nation. There have been two particular policies that this party has followed throughout the years. One of them has been the maintenance on the north half of the North American continent of a free and independent Canada. In the days of Macdonald, on two occasions he fought battles for the maintenance of that principle. We followed it throughout the years. They charged us with being anti-American because we took a stand on behalf of Canada and her rights. I have no apologies to offer now or in the years ahead for that stand, which will be proven right. Never before, though, was there as much interference by certain elements in the United States in a Canadian election.

We had the closest of relationships with the United States. Only the other day the former president, General Eisenhower, that great American and great leader of men, said that we had no differences that could not be solved. We were able to get together. There was no interference on the part of either side. I say, sir, that we have a right to declare our policies for Canada and to determine

them without dictation. I am going to refer to one policy and ask what is the position today in that connection.

A nation cannot survive if it becomes a satellite. Those are not my words. Those are the words of one of those who occupy the treasury benches today. Were we anti-American? What did the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Sharp) say? It is surprising how things said by them turn out to be pro-Canadian, but if we say the same thing we are dangerous to the unity of the western world. Let me read some excerpts from a speech given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce at Windsor on November 9, 1962. "Can Canada preserve a separate identity beside the United States," was the topic for discussion.

As some of my friends have remarked, however, I have much to learn about politics, and one of the things I find most difficult to learn is always to play it safe.

He proved that in London a few days ago when he took his stand against the commonwealth. I will refer to that in a moment.

Then he went on to say this, that we need not fear the commission of a sexual offence or even an offer of marriage from the United States.

Then he said this:

I suggest however, that we are in danger of losing the essentials of nationhood and perhaps our will to survive as a nation.

This is the man who today is Minister of Trade and Commerce in this government. He asked:

Can anything be done about it?

Then he went on to say:

—the key to the preservation of our separate identity is not so much to resist American penetration as to reduce and minimize our dependence on American money, ideas and culture.

Is that anti-American or not? Quote me as ever having gone that far. Then he went on to say this:

We shall have to begin to regain control of our own destiny.

I had better read the whole of it or they will say I left something out.

The remedy for this dependence is not to raise barriers against the capital inflow but to order our internal affairs that our international accounts are brought into balance, that is, to learn to live within our means. When that happens we shall begin to regain control of our own destiny.

What does that mean—that we have lost it? Then he said:

Then and only then can we hope to bring the process of alienation of ownership and control of Canadian industry to a stop.

Then he said this:

We should not be dependant upon foreign capital to maintain a healthy rate of economic growth