

The Address—Mr. Stanfield

dence in the future, confidence that certainly the government was lacking last spring and last winter. There has been some progress through diversification, and farmers in the west deserve a great deal of credit for the way in which they have diversified. Recently, I was able to stay on a large grain farm—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: A substantial number of farmers are not growing any wheat other than durum and great efforts are being made to diversify, but the situation on farms throughout the west in general is very difficult. The problems are far from over and the cash position is most unsatisfactory. For the government to create the impression in the country at large that the western agricultural problems are largely solved, I suggest, is irresponsible.

As to the speech itself, it proposes some legislation, largely legislation we had in the last session. I hope it is vastly improved, and if it is sensible and positive it will certainly receive full co-operation from this side of the House.

Certainly the government made at least one serious slip in the Speech from the Throne. At one point, in a moment of honesty or perhaps forgetfulness, the speech referred to "the distant ideal of a just society".

Mr. Hees: It is getting more distant every day.

Mr. Stanfield: That is what the government says it has been giving. I thought during the last couple of years that was the slogan. It seems that by its own admission the further the government moves in its chosen direction, assuming it has one, the farther the goal recedes from view.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This is an indication of the achievements of this government. It marches boldly ahead to the sound of its own slogans in no particular direction. But that does not matter. As long as the slogans, of which the just society is the main one, and the pretentious declarations are still there to roll off the tongue, then all is well. It is not a battle against real problems; it is the sententious verbalizing, the glorious preparations, the bands, the parades, the cheers of the faithful, those are the things that count. The government accepts the task in its own style.

We were supposed to get a couple of years of house-cleaning, of thinking and of white papers, and then a lot of action. A science policy is pretty important in a modern nation. Here we are, more than two years since the election, with no science policy. We heard the declaration that the government will consider carefully the recommendations of the Senate Committee on science policy and the Science Council of Canada. That certainly shows some profound thinking and some courage.

As to the use of drugs, which is a growing problem, again the government says that we will have to consider
[Mr. Stanfield.]

carefully the recommendations in the report of the LeDain Commission. Obviously, nothing has been done in this area. As to the abortion, we are going to have a day's debate on it.

We are still being promised white papers, and we cannot even get those in time. Last year we got a couple of dillies: one on tax reform and one on foreign policy. Can you imagine any government spending two years on producing a white paper on foreign policy? Now, when we are supposed to be past the era of white papers and entering the era of action we are promised white papers on communications, citizenship, immigration, national defence, and income security. Last year we were promised seven white papers and we got three. This year the same old white papers are promised, but, ones on immigration and communications have been added. Does communication mean the Post Office? If it does, we were promised a white paper on the Post Office last year. But I can readily understand that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) might ask the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) to produce a white paper on communications. It will be a relatively harmless occupation in which to indulge I think.

Here we are more than two years after the election during which the Prime Minister of Canada invited Canadians to come with him. Where has he led them? He has led them further away from the just society. I say that in the past two years this government has dissipated the spirit of 1967. Constitutional reform is not even mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, although last year it was emphasized and so was the importance which the government attached to it. This was the big appeal in 1968. We would have an entrenched bill of rights. Since then we have had failure. I think it is fair to say that in the area of constitutional discussion no progress has been made, with the exception of some assurance with regard to regional disparity. You would think from the speech we heard yesterday that no constitutional problems existed in this country and that no tensions existed. Is this the view of the government? After the Quebec provincial election many Canadians felt that the problem of the relationship between Quebec and the rest of Canada was settled, and that it could be forgotten. Is that the view the government of Canada is encouraging, in spite of an election in which 23 per cent of those who voted supported a party dedicated to the cause of separatism?

● (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Trudeau: They could not vote for the Conservative party.

Mr. Stanfield: No, they could not vote for the Conservatives, and I hope those people don't start voting Conservative.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Since then we have had another federal-provincial conference with no visible progress, at least no progress visible to the naked eye. Recently, the Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, who had previously been emphasizing the importance of creating jobs, and I