

The Address—Mr. Yurko

Commission is not necessarily an adequate mechanism to handle the problem.

Sixth, it should have enunciated the need to maintain and increase international trade with all nations and, in particular, to maintain and increase western Canadian grain trade with Russia and China.

Seventh, the Government should have announced its intention to become a full member of the Organization of American States and play its full and destined role in the future of the Americas.

Eighth, the Government should have announced new determination and new mechanics to reduce United States-Soviet tensions.

Ninth, in my view the Berger moratorium on building a gas pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley should have been scrapped.

Tenth, capital gains taxation should have been again revised either by totally scrapping it or by providing a maximum non-taxable annual gain of \$25,000 for all taxpayers.

Eleventh, a constitutional limitation on the national debt as a percentage of the national GNP should be considered seriously. The increasing debt structure is not a comfort to national well-being.

Twelfth, some major policy changes on energy pricing and taxation should be worked out with the provinces. Energy feedstocks for all petrochemical upgrading plants should be free of any federal taxation. Domestic crude oil energy pricing should be fixed to international pricing. All major oil sands plants should pay no royalties and no federal taxes until full capital recovery of the plants has been accomplished. An entire new natural gas pricing regime for export should be evolved. The PIP exploration grant program should be effectively equalized as between offshore and onshore exploration.

Thirteenth, property taxes paid on the principal residence by all families should be deductible as income for calculating both federal and provincial income tax. No one should have to pay taxes on taxes in our free society.

● (1210)

These are but a few areas of concern that might have been included in the Throne Speech as government policies. There are others. Permit me to speak briefly about the quality of the debate thus far.

From past experience, I would have thought that the Throne Speech debate would have brought some life to this House but it has produced little more than a yawn. I am reminded of a plaque I once gave to my brother which describes this place quite appropriately. It states: "Sometimes we sits and thinks—and sometimes we just sits". Perhaps this place sits and thinks sometimes, but I have concluded that mostly it just sits.

Not long ago I read in Richard Needham's column in *The Globe and Mail* a nugget of wisdom I thought I would share with the House. Needham said that silence should never be broken unless it can be improved upon. Unfortunately, it is

often the case in this House that when silence is broken, it is not improved upon. That cannot, however, be said for the Leaders' day debate that took place on December 9. The verbal joust that occurred in the House of Commons that day was oratory *par excellence*. Exchanges of the like that we witnessed are too few and far between.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as we approach the next election, the Leaders of the three Parties should be encouraged to face each other more often across the floor of this House in open debate. Canadians want to see them test their intellectual mettle, they want to see them exchange the occasional barb, to blow off steam, and even to broach a subject which appears to have become taboo—that is policy. Although it was a little thin on ideas, the Leaders' day debate was stimulating and exciting, there was no denying that. It was a grand prelude to entry into 1984 when all of Canada will know who will lead the pack and who will be sent to pasture. It was a good debate even though it was a debate of words rather than of ideas.

May I repeat several statements I made in this assembly in my very first speech on October 11, 1979. I said then:

We would be wise to remember that the troika that leads all good governments consists of honesty, husbandry and humility.

Second, I said:

I look upon the world society and I see it adrift. There seem to be no overall goals, no consistent philosophy, no inspiration, no overall meaning, not even any hope. The global society seems apprehensive and confused. It is the rapid growth of technology that has brought us to this condition; whereas on one hand we have the potential to build heaven on earth, and yet on the other we can create hell on earth and destroy it utterly as a place for mankind.

It is on these two areas of concern that I also wish to speak briefly today.

More and more Canadians are beginning to sense that Canadian leaders—political, scientific, business, religious and even labour leaders—have a unique role to play in stabilizing the nuclear madness that faces the world society. We all support the Trudeau world peace initiative. We support the initiative not as a partisan political policy or ploy, but as a desperately needed shot in the arm for generating political will to find world peace and the reduction of world tension.

The Prime Minister is doing what destiny and geography has dictated that he do. He is the leader of this nation. Canada is a nation which is sandwiched between the two most powerful nations in the history of mankind, each capable of destroying the world with its respective nuclear potential. It is incumbent upon the leader of this nation of Canada actively to seek accommodation and peace between our two global, giant neighbours. We must seek not only peace but peace with freedom rather than peace with slavery, and by slavery I mean slavery to fear, apprehension, pessimism and hopelessness.

In fact, I do have some minor criticism to direct to the Prime Minister in regard to his pilgrimage of peace. Why has it taken him so long? I, like so many others, kept repeating the need for a superpower summit conference almost two years before the Prime Minister was struck by a bolt of lightning. The 1981 Pugwash conference in Banff which I was fortunate