

a factor to impel me not to face facts. As members we need the determination to be here. We could do more for parliament provided the press, radio and television would report something concerning what is said by every member. When a backbencher gets up and makes a carefully prepared speech he does not even receive honourable mention. We will never build parliament in that way.

I notice that the new house leader has come up with a new idea. He says that he is not receiving enough advertising. In the *Ottawa Journal* of May 6, 1967 the following appeared under the heading, "Orders Surgery on Health Dept. Image."

Health Minister MacEachen has directed his department to adopt "a radical new public relations approach" to improve its present "poor image".

It does not say whether that is the minister or the department. He goes on to say that from now on he does not want the public relations men to inform the public of the programs but that what is needed is information.

That, above everything else, is what I suggest parliament needs today. Friends of mine have sat in the gallery and when it was all over they said to me, after they read the press account the next day, they could not recognize the parliament they saw. The number one project for this year is that parliament should project itself. Many changes in the rules are necessary to enable us continually and more effectively to discharge our responsibilities. These changes, however, should be made by agreement, not compulsion by the government as a matter of parliamentary expediency. The house would solve a great deal of absenteeism if some part of the proceedings were televised. It would not be very long before constituents in all parts of Canada would be pointing out that they could not find their member. The impelling result of this publicity upon all of us in public life would be amazing.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there was very little in the speech from the throne. What are some of the things which should have been and are not in the speech from the throne? First, there should have been a declaration that parliament will put a stop to the removal of our traditions. Let us end this race to remove those things which made possible our sitting here. Had it not been for successive British governments Canadians would have had no rights. The argument advanced at the time of

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

confederation was that unless we confederated and stood together the rights of language and religion would be lost—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** —if we became a part of the United States.

I ask the Prime Minister, what has happened to the war on poverty? Certainly a cease-fire has taken place. It may well be that the war is over. We have been told nothing at all about that. Why is there no reference, except in a general way, to broadening economic expansion? Why is there no reference to what parliament will be asked to do in the event that the Kennedy round of negotiations collapses—and I hope it will not. They have been talking for four years and now the various countries face and impasse.

What is the government of Canada going to do provided the United Kingdom does what it believes is best for the United Kingdom and joins the European common market? What will happen to our agricultural market? I read the other day that the prime minister of the United Kingdom said that so far as possible the United Kingdom intends to preserve and protect those preferences. What has the government of Canada, aside from silence, done in the face of a situation which, if the United Kingdom enters the European common market without some qualification, will have a detrimental effect not only on agriculture but also on our aluminum industry and several other industries? Why was there no mention of that?

Why is there only a generality about confederation? In the last four years we have seen this government go through all kinds of transformations. To start with we had "two nations" and the "opting out" provision. Then we had one pension law for the rest of Canada and one for the province of Quebec. If the "two-nation" proposition was a good one when it was enunciated by the Prime Minister in April of 1963, then the idea that any province can enter into treaties is a tenable one. Why was nothing said about that in the speech from the throne?

When we convened a conference on February 4, 1963, to discuss Canadian confederation we did it on the basis of the words of Sir John Macdonald when in his seventy fifth year he said in the House of Commons:

I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that, by any mode whatever, there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other. I believe that would be impossible if it were tried, and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible.