

The third thrust was to ensure that Canadian pricing in that industry would not be determined by international cartels. In that respect we have managed, throughout the 1970s, to keep prices for oil and gas in Canada below world prices. In many years they were substantially below world prices. We did not do that by using arbitrary constitutional measures such as declaratory powers and so on. We did it through negotiations—hard, difficult negotiations between the producing provinces and the consuming provinces. Much of the time both the consuming and producing provinces were Tory provinces. That is a reconciliation feat: to get the Tories to agree on something in between. I do not know how the Leader of the Opposition will do it. Mr. Lougheed seems to say that he will wait to reopen the question until the Tories are in power. That is good; we are prepared to wait a long while. But presumably he wants oil and gas prices to be completely decontrolled.

What is the position of the Leader of the Opposition on that? He is thinking hard. He is thinking hard of what to say because if he gives me one answer he will please Premier Lougheed and if he gives me another he will please Premier Davis and Premier Hatfield. He surely will not be able to please both. Therefore he does not give any answer but just attacks the policy. There we are, the coalition of the antis. For every action is the reaction over there, the ugly face of reaction sitting on the Tory benches.

● (1450)

The Leader of the Opposition went out of his way to say that “particularly odious”—because “retroactive” in some sense did not explain it—“particularly unacceptable” was the back-in provision. The back-in provision, when you come to think of it, we see as a way to give the Canadian people a share in discoveries which were made, thanks to their tax dollars, paid by way of incentives or tax exemptions. But that is the philosophical view. I can understand the Leader of the Opposition not sharing it. He does not believe in the role of the state as protector of the interests of the people, except if it is the provincial state, the Washington state, or something like that. But not the Canadian Government state.

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** How will he deal with Mr. Peckford? He not only wants back-in but he thinks the back-in at a measly 25 per cent is not big enough. He wants back-in at 40 per cent. Mr. Buchanan, I guess, thinks 25 per cent is all right but he wants his share right away; he wants the Minister to collect it so he can get the money right away.

The Leader of the Opposition has talked about a measure of tenderness in federal-provincial relations. Let him talk to the Premier of Newfoundland, let him talk to the Premier of Nova Scotia, and he will come back here feeling pretty tender, I can assure him!

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** I do not want to go on too long, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** More!

*The Address—Mr. Trudeau*

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, a little bit longer then. Maybe I should talk about international problems.

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** The Leader of the Opposition discovered, he told us, the peace movement as early as October 28, 1983. He knows something about the subject. I am very happy for the support he promises to give to the Government's initiative. I think it would be good and proper in this matter that we have a bipartisan approach. He asked me for my comments on his eight-point policy.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Seven.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I believe he enunciated them last Sunday to a group in Toronto. I think much of it is okay. There is one point on which I have some problem. It is about the no first strike. I wish I could ask the Leader of the Opposition what he means by that because I have already heard that his official critic for defence and his official critic for external affairs do not agree on it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** They shake their heads. They do agree on it. I would be very interested to hear what they would say if I were to stand in this place and propose a radical change to a fundamental posit of NATO strategy. I wonder if they would not say it would be better if that were done in some more discreet forum. If they are proposing to abolish the no first strike or no first use, depending on what meaning they mean, they would be I do not say saying the wrong thing, but I would say saying it in the wrong place at the wrong time.

For that reason I think it would be better if I reserved this kind of discussion for the NATO forum, which we are doing. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in that sense I commend the Leader of the Opposition for having some forward thinking. I would not want to bless every aspect of it lest I damn myself with our NATO allies. I am certainly prepared to discuss it with him or with his Party in this House or in other places, certainly with the honourable former Leader of the Opposition and former Prime Minister, who has been appointed to a task force on this subject.

I have in mind that when I first made my statement the Leader of the Opposition was a little bit condescending and said I should not be raising subjects which would cause some confusion in NATO and perhaps some distress in Washington. He said—am I quoting him correctly?—“illusions of grandeur”? I withdraw it. I was told without my knowing it that the Leader of the Opposition had said that. I do know that the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) called me a self-appointed messiah.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** Denied again. Maybe not “self-appointed” but “self-annointed”.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!