

*The Address—Mr. Martineau*

brief it does not meet the aspirations of the Canadian people who want a plan providing true security.

This plan is expensive and the benefits are not as extensive as those which had been promised. Why was it not proceeded with somewhat logically? Why has the government not taken the trouble of consulting the provinces beforehand? It might have avoided the mess which has resulted.

We are in favour of the principle of contributory pension. We always have been. We had the question of social security, including the pension fund, studied by experts.

Mr. Speaker, we introduced before the house a measure providing for a constitutional amendment, which is the means for the government to take in this field if it wants to show due regard to the other partners of confederation, the provinces.

This method has been scoffed at. Mr. Speaker, what are the other social security measures which have been passed since April 21?

Has the government shown any interest in underdeveloped areas? Has it tackled the nucleus of poverty, endemic pauperism?

The government was also to restore Canada's prestige abroad. In that respect, it did very little. There were, of course, the recent peregrinations of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) to Washington and Paris. I leave it to you to appraise the results.

When will the Secretary of State for External Affairs of this country clearly state Canada's attitude with regard to the Organization of American States, or to any other matter?

Mr. Speaker, there has been no protest in the field of external affairs.

Of course, there has been the matter of defence—and I am pleased to see the minister here in the house. He was to formulate a defence policy, but put the axe to everything in the defence field. What is left to us? Is he ready to introduce compulsory military service in this country? I know a fellow member of his party advocated such a measure which is now on the order paper.

On this side of the house we would like a clear definition of Canada's defence policy and the future part this country will play within the alliance.

How can the minister see to Canada's defence, when he is not even able to insure the defence of our armouries, and I am asking this question in all sincerity.

Last week many people were dismayed when the minister announced that munitions stored in armouries were to be taken away in

[Mr. Martineau.]

order to protect those buildings. In my opinion, the minister was thereby confessing that he could no longer ensure the defence of those places. And yet it is that same minister who boasts of changing everything in the field of national defence, who wants to give it a new role, establish a new policy which he refuses to put before us and provide for the Canadian people the security they have a right to expect from the government. That was an altogether astonishing admission on the part of a responsible minister, one which will surely make history in the political annals of Canada.

And now what about national unity? We applaud the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) when he makes a rousing appeal for national unity such as he did last week.

Words are not enough, action must follow. Is the formula of co-operative federalism not just a gimmick to deceive gullible people, a smokescreen behind which is plotted a return to centralization, to intensification of joint programs and, therefore, to federal government infringement upon provincial jurisdiction?

Have we not seen also the substitution of the federal-provincial conferences for the letter of the constitution? I am in favour of consultations and federal-provincial conferences, but they must not be used to change the terms or the letter of the constitution, to replace them with some agreement, because this would be breaking with the true spirit of confederation.

Mr. Speaker, we can see that there is very little ground for confidence in this government, and the speech from the throne is but a lean sketch. Where can you find in this shapeless program, made up of warmed over measures and the same old stories that grate on the ear, anything to stimulate the strong or encourage the weak, to paraphrase some of the expressions the Prime Minister likes so much?

If the government is counting on that meager dish to treat its supporters or starve its opponents, I am afraid that it is deceiving itself and that it will be unable to win confidence that obviously it no longer deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that an impartial jury could not but reach a verdict of guilty about the government. It must be concluded that this government must be beheaded.

You might tell me: The government is a government made up of weak people. That is obvious, but is there an acceptable alternative to the present government? I submit that there is an alternative and that our party can supply it, because it is based on the very principles of progressive conservatism which rest on fiscal responsibility, economic growth and respect of the confederative pact.