

*The Address—Mr. Ryan*

Because I was closely associated with the NATO picture and Canada's position in the Alliance I was deeply disturbed when the Prime Minister, before the last election, began questioning this country's participation. I was alarmed at his and others' remarks afterwards. As chairman of our Parliamentary Association I had travelled for two and a half years liaisoning with the 14 other NATO countries. When he did not seek my opinion I wrote to him offering to prepare a memorandum of my thoughts on NATO for him to consider but received no reply whatsoever.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. Ryan:** While I did not and do not want our troops to remain in Europe forever or even to carry on their nuclear roles past 1975 when our planes will be obsolete, I believed and still do that we must pay our fair share of the premium for this successful insurance policy. The irony of our unilateral reduction of our heavy armoured brigade at Soest and our air wing in southern Germany against the spirit of the Harmel report and the pleadings of our allies is that the air mobile force will have to be equipped with helicopters and other forms of transport that will likely cost more than the tanks and planes to purchase and to operate, and NATO really does not need that role filled as it did the former ones. To some degree our participation in the alliance has been maintained but the cost to our country's reliability in the 14 other NATO countries has been great.

So much for the west. In the east the government has been on its knees for almost two years trying to be recognized by Red China, to the dismay of a great many Canadians, the United States and almost every country on the Pacific rim. After the last election the government decided to recognize Red China even if it meant withdrawing recognition of the Republic of China at Taiwan and expulsion of its embassy at Ottawa. This is said to be a logical thing to do because Mao in Red China rules over millions of people and a large territory and has *de facto* control. Exactly the same logical case can be put for the recognition of Rhodesia and East Germany, but the Secretary of State for External Affairs has stated in the House that Canada will not recognize these regimes. Neither Red China nor any other country should dictate our foreign policy.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Ryan:** And it certainly should not dictate to us what our relations will be with any other country or any other government, but it did. Now the Maoists have a red carpet to Ottawa and a front seat view of Washington at a time when the author of this misfortune has found it necessary to invoke the War Measures Act to fight their like and to cancel his trip to Moscow. Oh, the irony of it all!

Like so many of the policies of the government, Mr. Speaker, the promise of participatory democracy in Canada is a sham. The "Action Trudeau", young live wires of 1968 have died in infancy. Contrary to vaunted,

[Mr. Ryan.]

bureaucratic utterances, the white paper on tax reform is not a valid example of participatory democracy. Mr. Philip Johnson of the *Montreal Gazette*, killed this notion dead when he wrote on September 30 last:

So what it boils down to is, in order for Mr. Trudeau's participatory democracy to work, every citizen must be rich, highly educated, unemployed and have access to all government information.

• (12:30 p.m.)

The only ones in Canada who appear to measure up to these standards are cabinet ministers, but even some of them are not that rich or educated.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Ryan:** Of course, a very bad feature of the policy of issuing a white paper and then debating tax reform in the various communications media and in House committees is that lawyers and accountants do not know how to advise their clients with any certainty. How can a lawyer possibly draw a good will these days for a client worth \$100,000 or more? This has been the situation for almost a year and it is likely to continue indefinitely. Many new business ventures, particularly in Ontario, have been stalled or lost because of the uncertainty created by the white paper.

After the federal changes are made the provinces will ask: where will we get our money and what will we do to adjust to the new changes in the income and estate taxes? I submit that these problems will continue for a long while yet. The provinces will not be happy either because, for some reason, they were never consulted before the white paper was drawn up or tabled. So much for this government's respect for co-operative federalism.

I am greatly concerned about urban problems, particularly as those of metropolitan Toronto are worse than those in any other city or region in Canada, and they promise to worsen rapidly. Everywhere across the country there is increasing unemployment, and cities are hard-pressed as they see ever larger numbers of employable people applying for welfare. They attribute the increase to the government's peculiar way of fighting inflation and they seek assistance from that government to make up the difference in the cost. So far there has been no sign of relief from Ottawa.

Urban transit presents grievous problems in both Canada and the United States, but the United States is doing something about them. The federal government there has committed itself to the provision of \$5 billion over a period of five years for the capital and operational requirements of urban areas throughout the United States, whereas the Canadian government up to this point has never really been involved in mass transit financing or planning.

Montreal, in addition to Dorval, is getting a great new international airport at Ste. Scholastique. Toronto and southern Ontario may or may not have another airport by 1976, and it may or may not be an international one. No one knows very much about it.