

*The Address—Mr. Deniger*

● (1720)

We do not have to criticize and should not criticize every act of the United States; of course not. We must equally point out where the Soviets are deceiving us. But we have to look at both sides and have a relative degree of independence in order to do so. This is what we do not have. This is why the mission of the Prime Minister is not discussed and is not taken seriously. A personal mission, no matter how important the person may be at home, will not be taken seriously abroad when the actions of the Government that person leads are so contrary to the goals and to the words he espouses. If Canada does not begin now—because it is never too late—to pursue policies which will bring about genuine and complete disarmament, then Canada will not be listened to tomorrow any more than it was last week.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question following on what she has just said. Does she really believe that the Communists of Moscow whose avowed object is world domination will ever completely disarm? Does she really believe they would?

**Ms. Jewett:** Mr. Speaker, I have no idea whether the Hon. Member is right about the avowed purposes of the regime in Moscow.

**Mr. Taylor:** Of course that is their purpose.

**Ms. Jewett:** All I know is that it has been very unsuccessful so far, beginning with China and going through several other countries, in failing to impress them with its right to dominate them. It has failed. It failed with Egypt and the Sudan. It has failed, failed and failed. I do not think that is in their minds too much right now.

The chances of having complete nuclear disarmament are as great or as little on one side as the other. May I just add that there was a feeling at the conference that if only the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were not there or did not exist, agreement could be brought about on disarmament and the concept of a common security instead of many individual nation states' security could be realized. However, that is not the way in which the world map is drawn, we have to deal with both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. When I say, "we have to", I mean that we have to have our voices heard. I say to the Hon. Member that our voices must be heard by both and directed to both because they are equally engaged in this nuclear peril. We and all smaller nations are concerned with the peril and want to share in seeing that it does not come about.

[Translation]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for La Prairie.

**Mr. Pierre Deniger (La Prairie):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise today in the House, this special place that is the guarantor of our parliamentary democracy. I am particularly delighted to be taking part in the traditional debate following the reading of the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, this long awaited speech was given several weeks before Parliament adjourned for the holidays. It

also marked the end of a parliamentary session that was unprecedented for the number and variety of its achievement.

The Throne Speech also announced the beginning of a new period in which what we had started would be pursued unremittingly. The list of Bills passed during this First Session of the Thirty-Second Parliament ending on November 30 last year is impressive, Mr. Speaker, and I therefore have no intention of enumerating all these achievements. However, I would like to mention that the past few years have shown once again that when governing a country, we parliamentarians often have choices to make that are not always easy.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, despite the difficulties arising from the worldwide recession which severely affected Canadians as well, I believe the Government has been both creative and courageous. Mr. Speaker, our humanitarian instincts have never failed us, at a time when it would have been so easy to turn away from our social responsibilities. I would rather not think of what a Conservative Government would have done during a recession. I can imagine what the historic annals of Canada, commemorating our time and our Government, would be like if they had to describe the beginning of this decade under a Conservative Government.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, what a nightmare, what a disaster it would have been to have the Conservatives during a depression! It would have been back to the law of the jungle or survival of the fittest. It is only a fantasy, Mr. Speaker, but it makes me shiver, and I hope with all my heart that, as the Prime Minister said in his Address, a Conservative Government will never come to power in this country, and especially not during a recession, because they would form a government of multinationals. A Government by abdication. That is the kind of government the Members opposite are offering us, Mr. Speaker. They are abdicating their responsibilities. They are the kind of people who give in—they have no backbone.

Mr. Speaker, let us take the case of medicare for instance. We must never deny the have-nots the availability of medical treatment whatever differences we may have with the provinces, we must not give in on this, because over the last year those differences widened to such an extent that the new Canada Health Act was introduced to clarify the aims of the Medicare Program. Because medicare is a right, rather than a privilege.

Throughout the debate, the Progressive Conservatives remained silent. But suddenly, Mr. Speaker, some day in December, they looked at a survey—I will come back to this—and decided they would support the proposal put forward by my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

In my view, that survey exemplifies and clearly and unequivocally reflects the two trends that exist on policy matters within Tory ranks. First, there is the Leader of the Opposition's outlook. Clearly it is unimaginative, its thrust being to antagonize no one. So before taking a firm position on