

**Mr. Broadbent:** I simply wanted to be clearly understood, because I want the Prime Minister to have a fair chance.

By refusing to spend more because it will increase the deficit, is the Prime Minister not reneging on a commitment that he made in the 1980 election campaign when he said that he—

**Some hon. Members:** Order. Order!

**Madam Speaker:** Order.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the quotation from the campaign was to the effect that we would not reduce the deficit or we would not solve our budgetary problems by taking away or destroying jobs. That is the effect of the quote which he just read. I repeated to the hon. member the other day that when we are budgeting for more than a \$10 billion deficit, it is obvious that we are not concerned with balancing the budget as much as we are concerned with creating opportunity for investment and workers. That is why there are literally, once again, billions of dollars which are planned for spending by various departments to create jobs and stimulate economic growth.

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** The only recourse that the Leader of the New Democratic Party can take is to say to spend more. We can say we would spend more and put the money on paper, but right now there are hundreds of billions of unspent dollars which are going to be spent in the plans that have been laid before Parliament.

● (1430)

**An hon. Member:** Hundreds of billions?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Let us spend that money and then, if the hon. member wants to say more, we can look at it again.

\* \* \*

#### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

##### POLAND—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON IMPOSITION OF MARTIAL LAW

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Madam Speaker, I would like to move from the world of fantasy land to the world of Poland.

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

**Mr. Crosbie:** On Monday when the Prime Minister was asked about Poland and his earlier approval of the actions of the Polish government, he said, and I quote from Monday's *Hansard*:

I do not believe that in advance we can or should condemn the use of troops by any of our friends—

#### Oral Questions

Apparently the Polish government is his friend.

The worse result in this case would have been intervention by the Soviet Union.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has since said the Soviet Union has intervened:

—once again we must ask ourselves if there was a better scenario.

Have the Prime Minister and his government, who have now had 46 days to decide this, yet decided whether there was a better scenario than the imposition of martial law and the crushing of human rights in Poland and doing away with the rights of the trade union, Solidarity? Has that been decided, or what is the Prime Minister going to tell the world when he appears on the television program Friday or Saturday night? Was that the best scenario, or was there an even better scenario?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I have asked this question of various people, including the representative of the Polish Congress that I met the other day. I asked the hon. member what was his scenario. I have indicated that if the alternative was Soviet invasion, it was better to have martial law if that prevented Soviet invasion. My statement still stands. It is hypothetical. No one knows if the Soviets would have invaded or not.

One does know that the objective of all the western nations for the past two years has been to warn the Soviet Union against invasion of Poland, and against military occupation of that country. To that extent we have succeeded in preventing that worse scenario. I would like to hear the hon. member say that he would prefer to see Soviet troops occupying Poland and that that would be better for the Polish people than to have the Polish people themselves attempt to prevent that eventuality.

##### REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER CONDEMN IMPOSITION OF MARTIAL LAW

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister has confirmed that what happened in Poland was the best scenario, in his opinion. In my opinion it was the worst scenario.

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

**Mr. Crosbie:** There was no threat of invasion by the U.S.S.R. The government's position is confused and contradictory. Apparently the Secretary of State for External Affairs has more backbone than the Prime Minister, who is positively pusillanimous in connection with Poland. My question to the Prime Minister is this. Last Monday the Prime Minister said, and I again quote from *Hansard*:

I will have to see in what way that martial law proceeds—

He was still not prepared to condemn martial law. Later that afternoon he met with the Canadian Polish Congress and said martial law should be relaxed. What is now the position—

**An hon. Member:** What is yours?