The Address-Mr. Trudeau

to the members of the House of Commons, *Vox populi*, *vox dei*. The first reason, I repeat, was to try and correct those areas in our administration where we had been incompetent, or where we had appeared to be incompetent.

• (1620)

I hasten to say that in my opinion there were sins committed by this government, although very few of them were sins of omission. Whether we look at our legislation or our policies having to do with the assertion of our sovereignty in the Arctic, with our extension of our territorial seas and fishing rights and two policies concerning people, such as our Indian policy and our multi-cultural policy; whether we go through foreign affairs, that whole area where we took steps which anteceded by some time some steps which were going to be taken by the President of the United States and which I think it is fair to say benefited this country, particularly in the area of trade and of wheat sales, or whether we go from that to our policy and legislation in the area of quality of life having to do with our numerous anti-pollution policies and legislation and the creation of national parks throughout Canada, I think it is fair to say that this government swept no problems under the carpet. It did not solve them all, by a long shot, but it did not try to escape any. It met them head on, and because of that we did make some mistakes; it is those mistakes which we propose to correct.

Before I give some examples of that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the point that we propose to correct these mistakes without in any way turning back on our Liberal principles and without in any way withdrawing from the faith that we, as Liberals, have in the land or the fact that we, as Liberals, always tend to err on the side of liberty rather than on the side of gain.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) spent some time attempting to show that we were plagiarizing and borrowing policies of his own, and that we were turning back on our principles. I even read a silly statement by someone that this is a "U-turn" government. I must say that what puzzled me, after his long recital of the measures that we have plagiarized and borrowed from him, was the statement that all these measures are such that he has now decided to vote against them. I think it will be important in giving some examples to indicate where we will try to redress some of the administrative mistakes or incompetencies, but I will show, in so far as I will give the examples, that in no case do they entail an abandonment of principle and in no case do they indicate a reversal of any of our Liberal policies.

One example can be given in the area of penal reform. A great deal was made during the election and before the election of the mistakes, and sometimes sorry ones, which had been made by those who in our penal system have been favoured by the government in an attempt to rehabilitate them. We are just now in possession of the Hugessen report on penal reform, the penal system and the matter of parole and bail. I think it is fair to say that we will ensure that these reforms are, and I repeat, in the

spirit of liberalism, because we think that Canada is fortunate enough a country, is rich enough a country, is educated enough a country and is peaceful enough a country to be able to seek new ways of rehabilitation and seek new ways of bringing back into the mainstream of humanity those people who have been punished by our penal system. What will be evident from the position taken by our Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) is that this will be done in such a way as to protect the public, and it is this reconciliation of these two things which this government will attempt to achieve.

In the field of immigration, again a Liberal policy of non-quota admission of people to this land who wanted to come and establish themselves here, resulted in a certain number of abuses. These abuses once again followed from the spirit in which we interpreted the laws, a spirit of trust and confidence in mankind. These abuses did happen, and in November we indicated how we would begin to eradicate them by taking action, for instance, against those who come as tourists and then decide to apply for landed immigrant status. We have already reversed that policy. We have already indicated to those who do come as tourists, and this was announced in December, that they will need work permits in order to work in Canada.

The third example of Liberal policy, which we in no sense renege on, and which is fundamental to the unity of this country but which did cause some difficulty in application, is the whole area of bilingual policy. We referred again in December, thankful that we had at least enough members to have a claim to form the government and to have occasion to carry into practice, to the pledge that had been made by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) some months before that he would, before the year's end, announce the principles whereby we would be able to pursue the policy of bilingualism in the civil service, yet do it in a way which would be completely respectful of the Pearson pledge of 1966 and of my own pledge some years later. We have made those principles public.

It was amusing, by the way, Mr. Speaker, to note that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) had obviously not got together in their reaction to these pledges and these principles. I understand that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe found that the principles represented a withdrawal from our move toward bilingualism and that the hon. member for Peace River felt they were indeed meaningless. I hope the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe will have, in the weeks and months to come, a number of occasions to educate his fellow members of the Conservative party and caucus about some of these principles.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: I, for one, welcome his entry into the Conservative party, although I must say I should have preferred that our good Liberal member had won in Saint-Hyacinthe. I do say his entry into the Conservative party is a good thing because it is important that Quebecers with reputation and prestige enter the ranks of the Conservative party as that is the only way we can ensure