

The Address—Mr. Rouleau

He goes on speaking of a close union between the various Canadian provinces. He tells us that one needs the other, and vice-versa.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Tremblay) thought of that, who boasts of being a separatist and who, on January 28 last, even attended the celebration of the fifth anniversary of the foundation of the "Alliance Laurentienne", under the leadership of Mr. Raymond Barbeau.

While the hon. member for Laval wants to strengthen confederation—and justly so—the hon. member for Roberval—that new, veteran separatist, was unflinchingly and complacently listening to the chairman of the "Alliance Laurentienne", who said:

Five years from now, we will not observe the centenary of confederation, but rather the independence of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, while one Conservative member expounds one dogma, another preaches the opposite. That is a striking instance of the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes feel a measure of sympathy for the leader of the Conservative party, the Prime Minister. How can the latter, as leader of the Conservative party, associate himself with members whose philosophies are so absolutely opposed to his own? On the one hand, we see people like the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Small), who openly states in the house his imperialist views and his opinions as an orangeman, and, on the other, men like the member for Roberval, a French-Canadian nationalist, who is opposed to confederation. And, between the two, we have a full range of Union Nationale members who have been sitting in this house since the last election.

Thus, with all these very divergent elements, little wonder that we now have a policy of confusion.

Mr. Pigeon: Could I put a question to the hon. member?

Mr. Rouleau: The hon. member can ask as many questions as he wants to when I have finished my remarks.

Mr. Pigeon: What do you think of the two flags advocated by your party?

Mr. Rouleau: Mr. Speaker, the comment is as trifling as the one who made it.

Since its coming into power, the Conservative party has acted only on the spur of the moment, and in all fields of activity, with the results that are well known. And evidence of this is given by the speech from the throne, which has been directly inspired by the impending election without any consideration being given to the economy of the

country. Faced by the imminence of an election, the government is bringing forward costly legislation without taking into account the economic balance of the country, thus risking to upset it.

It is, therefore, not surprising to note, in the editorials published in various newspapers throughout the country, the concern expressed by the editors about the expenses that might result from the carrying out of the measures announced in the speech from the throne.

To give an example may I quote from an editorial published in the *Montreal Gazette* on the day after the speech from the throne was read:

(Text):

It has come to be expected, as a matter of course, that a government, facing an election, will make promises. But is there not a prior obligation to have the money with which the promises might be carried out? For a government that is already deep in debt and deficits to promise to undertake new commitments, large and lasting, is scarcely to accept responsibility.

Yet this is the pattern outlined in the speech from the throne. The government in the current fiscal year is running a deficit that amounts to about \$1.3 billion.

Mr. Clancy: What paper are you reading from?

Mr. Rouleau: The *Montreal Gazette* of January 23, 1962.

(Translation):

Mr. Speaker, that is why the businessmen and the newspapers are concerned about the policies of the present government which lack consistency and preparation.

As I stated earlier, the present government acts on the spur of the moment. Moreover, the government has brought forward in the speech from the throne legislation which will require the co-operation of the various provincial legislatures in order to be implemented. Proposed legislation has been announced without the provinces having been consulted, for the sole purpose of window dressing on the eve of an election campaign.

The government has announced an increase in old age pensions and the setting up of a contributory pension system without having consulted the provinces.

The increase in pensions for the blind and the disabled persons was also announced without prior consultation with the provinces.

The Senate reform is another measure which I feel requires consultation with the provinces.