

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

**Mr. Pearson:** That is a Canadian Press account of what I am supposed to have said which I corrected the next day with the Canadian Press, and then the correction was reported.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I have the entire record here.

**Mr. Pearson:** The right hon. gentleman has not it all.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt whether the press can keep up with the perambulations of the hon. gentleman. Then he comes along and makes his statement today, and I doubt if you or anybody else, Mr. Speaker, can come to any conclusion as to what he means on the subject. He is on this side and he is on that side. There are difficulties in the way. He asks a question on one occasion. Again he may rise if he wishes to deny that he made the statement, that it should have been concluded in the fall. In other words, a decision should have been made in the fall.

**Mr. Pearson:** When you said it was going to be made, the minister said it was going to be made in the fall.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** This is after the event. It is made perfectly clear that we are going to have the support of the Leader of the Opposition in the event that there is a finalized decision in this regard. All the way along he says, "Are we moving out of our own league?" In Edmonton he says, "Are we getting in too deep?" He also said: that the United States had to keep up with each new costly defence development, but Canada should not have to follow suit.

Then again we find another Canadian Press dispatch quoting the Leader of the Opposition as saying that the decision to cancel the Arrow production order should have been made in the fall instead of waiting until March.

The hon. gentleman now says that he corrected these statements next day. As far as we are concerned in connection with this matter we made our decision clear on September 23, 1958, in the statement which I made at that time. At the time the statement was made the situation was particularly dangerous in Quemoy and Matsu islands and in the straits. At that time there were those who felt that a major war might very well break out, that it was within the realm of possibility. If the decision had been made then, it would have brought about the demobilization of the technical men who, in the event that hostilities came about, would have purposes other than the production of the Arrow which would be found necessary

in Canada. That was the reason for the stand which we took and made clear. No one who makes a decision such as that can possibly do so lightly.

Since the ICBM's and latterly, the launching of lunik, it is apparent that there has been a tremendous change in the techniques of potential war. It is a disagreeable course. Let me make this matter perfectly clear. Lobbies will have no effect on the decision that this government makes on the question of defence. That statement applies generally. While the government will at all times welcome suggestions, ideas and arguments, I think the experience generally has been that the stronger the lobby, the weaker the argument.

I am now going to deal for a moment with one or two matters in the speech from the throne. I am not going into the detail into which the hon. gentleman went this afternoon but I am going to meet one or two of the arguments which he advanced and which are somewhat threadbare and tattered. They have been used over and over again with the effectuality that the hon. gentleman must realize unless he is getting his opinion from the grass at \$25 a dinner.

In the speech from the throne we have set forth the legislative program which includes various fields of legislative enactments and amendments to existing legislation. There is one matter to which I want to refer and to which the hon. gentleman did not refer, namely the item dealing with the setting up of an energy board. We have the recommendation of the Borden commission in a preliminary report. So that there will be no mistake or misunderstanding, let me say this. No prior knowledge of the contents of this report were in the possession of any member of the government. The facts that reports by royal commission are made does not indicate or mean that in every or in any particular they will be carried out, when in the opinion of the government, which accepts this responsibility, those recommendations are detrimental in any way.

I want to make that perfectly clear at this time relative to the various recommendations contained in that report. We will deal with that question when this particular matter comes before the house in the form of a bill.

Now I am going to return to the speech of the hon. gentleman—a speech consisting for the most part of lamentations but with no indication of what suggestions the opposition have to offer, excepting the inference that taxes should be raised, higher interest rates secured and credit restrictions imposed—a speech full of colourful language—jeremiads usually are—and full of forebodings, not uttered with the usual smiling face, except