

The Address—Mr. Pearson

the effect that Canada should become a republic. He must have been referring to a provincial conference of some university Liberals who, this being a free country and the Liberal party being a free party, passed such a resolution by a vote of I believe 42 to 38.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the national meeting?

Mr. Pearson: There was no national meeting that passed—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, there was.

Mr. Pearson: My right hon. friend should not take these university resolutions too seriously, because university Conservatives not long ago passed a resolution advocating the abolition, not of the monarchy, but of my right hon. friend. I do not think they are going to find it so easy to abolish him.

Then the right hon. gentleman complained that we had not included in the speech from the throne some taxation proposals. This is a new interpretation of what should be included in a speech from the throne. He also, as an indication of the sins of commission on the part of this government, gave an illustration of how last Friday, from nine o'clock on, the country was saved from the tyranny of this government trying to slip through six \$1 items in the estimates at the last minute. My right hon. friend must know that in one year of his regime 31 \$1 items appeared in the estimates of his government—31 items.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether any legislative items at all appeared. First of all, I should note that the Prime Minister was not here but was down in the United States telling them what they should do about announcing policy.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there were some legislative items; but the difference is that when my right hon. friend does this it is all right, but when we do it it is all wrong; and that is what is known as party government.

● (5:00 p.m.)

The right hon. gentleman had a good deal to say also about the constitutional question and the formula now being considered for amending our constitution in Canada rather than in Great Britain. I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this matter at any length but it certainly will be dealt with during the course of this debate and subse-

quently. I would remind my right hon. friend of something he has tried awfully hard to forget, that he and his minister of justice, Mr. Davie Fulton, tried for years to get agreement with the provinces on the basis of the formula which is, in all essentials, exactly the formula that is now produced.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That statement is untrue.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Fisher: But that does not make it right.

Mr. Pearson: No, that does not make it right. But that does not make it wrong, either. My authority for making that statement is the former minister of justice himself, Mr. Davie Fulton. The formula is now known as the Fulton-Favreau formula. My hon. friend was not even generous enough to his former minister of justice, who is coming back into federal politics, to link his name with this formula.

My right hon. friend should also make up his mind from what flank he is going to attack this formula. He has shot at us from both flanks this afternoon. At one time it was going to balkanize Canada, and at another time it was so inflexible and rigid there could be no change made. He had better decide upon what flank he is going to attack. Let me remind my right hon. friend, when he is so bitterly critical of this formula—that is his right and no doubt he will be able to thresh it out in this House of Commons—that every province in this country except one, including the province of Ontario, has approved of this formula. It has been submitted, in every case except Newfoundland, to the legislatures. Surely it cannot be all bad when the premier of Ontario and the premier of Manitoba think it is good. However, as I say, we will be able to argue this later, and it is a very important matter which deserves the detailed consideration of this house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow the right hon. gentleman any further into his peregrinations, but I do not believe we should take them too seriously. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman thinks anything is grist to his somewhat dilapidated political mill, of which he is now in control of 52 per cent.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at the speech from the throne we should look at it not exactly from the point of view of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition but