

*The Address—Mr. Chrétien*

We had a lot of slickness last Friday.

—smoothness, pat answers, feeling that there is no substance, plastic image and the feeling that you are someone's candidate—big business or Conrad Black.

It continues like that for pages and pages. While it is the problem of the Leader of the Opposition, it was visible in the House last week. We heard absolutely nothing of substance on anything. There was just attack and no solution. There was contradiction about everything. We have seen it since the beginning. Suddenly the Americans invade Grenada and two hours after that they were on the side of the Americans. Twenty-four hours after that Prime Minister Thatcher of England said that the Americans were wrong, so they were not on the side of the Americans any more. They sent the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour) to inquire about the situation and we are still waiting for the answer. This is the type of policy that they are trying to offer to us. We are not too afraid of that type of approach, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Mayer:** Call an election then. If you are not afraid, call an election.

**Mr. Chrétien:** The time will come. We will finish our mandate because we have to tell Canadians what happened over the last four years.

**Mr. Mayer:** We will challenge you. We will move a motion right now. I will get up on a point of order and move a motion right now.

**Mr. Chrétien:** That is where we will be able to face these gentlemen. When we came to Parliament four years ago the people of Canada were faced with one of the biggest problems that we have had since the war. We were faced with the separation of Quebec from Canada. We have tackled the problem. There was a referendum and Canada won, but they do not talk about it any more. We decided to patriate the Constitution. They were in favour of that but they dragged the debate on for months in the House of Commons. They were in favour of a Bill of Rights, but I was a witness in front of the committee for 115 hours. All the time they were for and they were against. They were on the side of motherhood and they were trying to block the Charter of Rights.

**Miss MacDonald:** And you kept women out of the Constitution. You kept equality out the Constitution.

**Mr. Chrétien:** We put them in.

**Miss MacDonald:** You kept them out.

**Mr. Chrétien:** The Members of the Opposition were telling us: "Just patriate the Constitution. We do not want a Charter of Rights; we have a Charter of Rights in Canada. We do not want the Brits to make a Charter of Rights for us".

**Some Hon. Members:** Shame on you.

**Mr. Chrétien:** That was their position. We said at the Canadian constitutional conference that we wanted to have a Charter of Rights immediately.

**Miss MacDonald:** We know what you did with a kitchen cabinet.

**Mr. Chrétien:** We have done it in spite of the Opposition, the delays and the frustration caused by the incapacity of the Opposition to decide.

To give another example, the other day some business people asked me why we have not enshrined property rights in the Constitution. The so-called business community wants it and wants to know who is blocking it. Not long ago the Leader of the House proposed that we enshrine in the Constitution property rights. It is the Opposition who denied us the opportunity to do that because they do not want to offend their Premiers in the provinces who are opposed to that. In the committee the PEI Government was the most strongly opposed to that. They are the head waiters. They have to wait and see what the Premiers say.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Pretty weak.

● (1530)

[Translation]

**Mr. Chrétien:** I also want to say a few words about the opportunity the Leader of the Opposition gave us when he opened his mouth just a little too wide. Yes, Mr. Speaker, he did, and it was about our energy policy. Well, we are still waiting for the answer, since that evening he stated with great enthusiasm that he was going to destroy our energy policy and that it was tantamount to holding up a gas station at three o'clock in the morning, but the next day he was in Edmonton, and not a word. As the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I said to myself: What is going on? Maybe he will bring up the subject in his speech on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. He did say timidly that he did not disagree with the objectives of our energy policy but was opposed to certain aspects, namely—

[English]

—confiscates someone else's property, to make the case.

[Translation]

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond and provide some explanations, since people have a right to know.

[English]

Parliament has set out in the legislation that the back-in is a way for Canadians to get access to the resources that are found in Canadian territory. When I negotiated with Newfoundland, Premier Peckford did not agree with me because he wanted a 40 per cent back-in and felt that I was too timid with the 25 per cent.

There is a proposition in the Speech from the Throne for a Bill to be tabled in the House which will permit Nova Scotia to benefit from the 25 per cent back-in right away. The Opposition Party says that it will remove that. I do not know what the Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) will have to say about that because Premier Buchanan has stated many times that he wants to have his back-in share