

take the two old line parties and place them both in the opposition. Then, with a new party, we should be—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gregoire: That is the comedy which has been repeated for 97 years, with those two old line parties always contradicting themselves, depending on which side of the house they sit.

I hope this situation has enlightened the people of Canada and that they will resolve to cast aside these two old political parties that for years have been encrusted in routine and have done absolutely nothing for the people, except to rant at each other. I hope that before long they will elect a party which will not merely hunger for power but will legislate for the people, so as to enact legislations which will give satisfaction to the people and enable them to live contentedly in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have been amazed at the attitude taken by the leader of the Liberal party in this house in the last week. In four long speeches, each lasting about an hour and a half, he repeated himself, of course, but brought forward no policy. He quoted statistics; so many hours, minutes, and seconds for the speeches of each party. Much good that did us. That is what he does all the time. He contradicted himself. Ever since General Norstad made his statement, the Leader of the Opposition seized upon it to make political capital out of it, and changed his stand and his line of argument as often as he changes shirts.

Mr. Speaker, what is exactly the position of the Liberal party at this moment? That position was stated yesterday by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), who made a good job of it indeed, but I find the position taken by the leader of the Liberal party so ridiculous that he cannot expect to run the affairs of a country like Canada, and this is something that we should do well to point out today to the people of Canada.

The leader of the Liberal party says: We are against atomic weapons, but we have given our word. Let us honour our commitments, let us accept atomic weapons and, afterwards, we shall do everything we can to get rid of them. That is the situation.

Mr. Legare: He never said that.

Mr. Gregoire: Did you ever hear a more ridiculous argument, coming from a statesman. And that proves one thing. When he was second in command, when he was working behind the scene, in other words, when

Alleged Lack of Government Leadership

he was only a civil servant and relied on his superiors for orders, the present leader of the Liberal party could afford to work for peace. But the leadership of his party went to his head and since he cannot do without orders, he sought them from foreigners. Since then he has been putting forward arguments like the ones he is setting forth now.

Mr. Caouette: Silly arguments.

Mr. Gregoire: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette) is quite right; those are silly arguments.

While listening to the speech the Leader of the Opposition delivered a few minutes ago, I noticed two striking contradictions.

He called for the arming of our NATO forces with nuclear weapons and, then, a few minutes later, he stated that NATO should not be allowed to become a nuclear power.

Mr. Legare: He did not say that.

Mr. Gregoire: That is what he said this afternoon. If your ears are blocked, wash them.

I should like to refer to certain remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition on January 25, 1963. Page 3125 of *Hansard* bears witness to another contradiction on the part of the hon. member. Here is what he said:

—as I stated earlier today, I accept the necessity, as does our party, of the nuclear deterrent.

A little further, on the same page and in the same column, he continued as follows:

I therefore repeat that, while keeping our pledges—

And by that he meant the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

—we would seek a better and more effective defence role for Canada in the alliance—

Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the Liberal opposition wishes our country to play a better role, why is he satisfied with mediocrity, with playing second fiddle? He has been contradicting himself without end on that point. The statement he made this afternoon was yet another contradiction.

The saddest part of all this is that only a few months ago hon. members, especially those from the province of Quebec, were strongly and uncompromisingly against the acquisition of nuclear armaments for Canada. And now, like sheep and followers, like slaves before their master, they crawl before him. Even if it is not their opinion, they agree. Yes chief, all right chief, we want nuclear weapons now.

Mr. Speaker, as I said already, voters of this country were betrayed in the past by