

felt this way, rightly or wrongly. Some thought capital punishment would cure all problems in respect of law and order. In any event, I think 80 per cent or 82 per cent of the public expressed a desire for a return to capital punishment. Again the Prime Minister and his government went against "accepted opinions", to put it in his own words.

The same thing can be said in respect of something called bilingualism. There have been many who have said for several years that if you try to force feed something as sensitive as the tongue before educating the mind you will get a reaction. You might well get linguistic differences becoming differences of opinion at times of election.

The Prime Minister has now pulled in his horns and taken his little election ball, put it into his back pocket and gone off to his swimming pool. Some of the great commentators of the land, including Anthony Westall, Christopher Young and Richard Gynn, now suggest we see bravery in the fact of cowardice. They say we see bravery in the face of retreat because, has the Prime Minister gone to the people, we might have had an election that divided the country along linguistic lines. What better way could there be to clear the air than to have an election? This might have been better than having a Prime Minister leading the country at a time when different linguistic lines may be part of his problem.

We can also take the question of unity, another basic issue. Most people say this country is ready for a change. They cannot accept the status quo with no change whatsoever. They will not accept René Lévesque's brand of change. Even Jean-Luc Pepin says, in his smiling, beautiful way, that there has to be a third option.

A member of my party, our leader in 1968, tried to get Canadians to pay attention to what perhaps should have been a change. He tried to get them at least to recognize that we were not all the same and could not all be tucked into one bushel basket. He pointed out there were very fundamental differences that added strength if we could only recognize the reality of two solitudes, or call it what you will.

We can also consider the economy, which is of somewhat germane importance. How does the Prime Minister react to accepted opinions in this regard? He referred to the issue on New Year's Eve when speaking of something called the "forces of free enterprise". He got many people upset with his musings.

My time is short during this adjournment debate, but I would love to debate with Your Honour or any other member of this House the creed of the Prime Minister. This creed has been a constant factor in respect of all his thinking and his opposition to accepted opinions. How insulting and how arrogant it is to have that one man think that opposition to

Adjournment Debate

accepted public opinions is the essence of consistency, when so many of these opinions about the problems of the land are quite to the contrary.

Perhaps the Prime Minister came to this conclusion on the basis of accepted opinions, as expressed by the Gallup poll, but I would like to know what else the Liberal caucus had. Quite frankly, it will be interesting to see how it all turns out. Perhaps there will be a conclusion to the very unfortunate reign of the present Prime Minister. When it is all sorted out, the bottom line will not represent accepted opinion but rather a realization on the part of the Prime Minister that he himself is sadly one of the problems of this land today.

Hon. Norman A. Cafik (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) raised this question, if we can put it in those terms, on May 11, 1978, at which time I read the question, if that is what you could call it, very carefully yet failed to understand just what it was. I can quite understand why Mr. Speaker interrupted at one stage, because it is a very difficult and elusive question, if one at all. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gave a very fleeting answer to this non-question, and I will give an equally fleeting answer.

● (2227)

I do not think that it deserves an answer at all. It is not a specific question relating to a specific point but seems to be facetious, jocular and should be treated in that way. However, the question that was raised here tonight is slightly different in that the hon. member seems to be raising a point that the Prime Minister's willingness to swim against the tide is some kind of disadvantage.

Every human being from time to time has to swim against the tide, and sometimes swim with it as well. In any event, the Prime Minister is a man of courage, conviction and a person who is quite prepared to say what he thinks when he thinks it. He deserves respect for that particular intellectual quality.

When the hon. member goes into the question of capital punishment and questions whether it was a free vote, I can say that I was a member on this side of the House who was not a member of cabinet at the time and I can assure the hon. member that it was a free vote as far as we were concerned. I would also point out that the leader of his own party voted against capital punishment.

The other questions that are raised are not really worthy of any further comment. It was a silly question and it deserves no response whatsoever.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at two o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.