

theory, a new Adam Smith, a new Karl Marx, a new John Maynard Keynes—

Mr. Broadbent: A new government.

Mr. Trudeau: What is needed is a simple decision on the part of the Canadian people to cooperate, to keep their costs down, to live within their means, to act together in a spirit of cooperation in every area of the economy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The government said this quite clearly in the Speech from the Throne yesterday. I will just read a short phrase which is to be found about half way into the Speech from the Throne:

This discontent in such a wealthy country must find its causes in the human spirit, and it is there also that the unity of the nation must be found.

We have seen, from listening to the Leader of the Opposition—I am sure it will be true when we listen to the leader of the New Democratic Party—that there are no economic signs that will tell the industrialized nations how they can improve the situation. We will see it is not a new Cain which is arising and telling us what must be done to create jobs, to reduce inflation. We see that even in the ranks of the opposition parties, within the same party, some will have one theory, others a contrary theory. It is not a new economic theory which we need; it is a new spirit, a new national will.

● (1653)

[*Translation*]

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in the area of national unity the same spirit of cooperation rather than confrontation is required. I am receiving lessons from the Leader of the Opposition who feels that there is too much aggressiveness on this side of the House. The analysis of these solutions can therefore show whether this is true. But I would be in total agreement with him if he was suggesting that in the area of national unity, progress will more surely come through cooperation than confrontation. Going through the history of our country, it is certain that it does not show of heavenly perfection. Obviously compromises were made all along between the various forces. Obviously these compromises never were final nor completely successful. But obviously they allowed our country to progress for 100 years, and made us one of the most privileged countries in the world.

We are what we are, Mr. Speaker, not on account of external powers and obligations laid on us, but because we have chosen our fate. Nobody has forced confederation on us, our federative system did not originate in Great Britain, France or the United States. Canadian federalism has been the creation of a properly Canadian genius and in the same way, Mr. Speaker, the new federalism which we are trying to set up must be devised by us. It must be adapted to present circumstances and answer the real problems confronting us today. How could I specify them, Mr. Speaker? I cannot dwell too much on the various social sectors, the different geographic areas giving rise to dissension.

The Address—Mr. Trudeau

If we consider the Indians, the Metis and the Inuit, it is certain that we must eradicate the cause of their alienation by giving them some time and also the financial means to find in their own mind their sense of direction, the place which they want to take in Canada, give them the opportunity to make legal and historic research which will enable them to gain satisfaction and obtain fair results. Again, as an example during the pipeline debate which lasted a few years, the Indian and Eskimo people of an area of the country have at various times, been able to express their objection to the Mackenzie solution and indeed, Mr. Speaker, this pipeline has not been built. Therefore, in this area as well as in others there must be a long process of consultations and exchanges.

The Atlantic provinces hold grievances dating back 100 years because their hopes have been frustrated. They believed that Confederation would provide them with more industries, more jobs, better transportation systems. What they are asking for is the possibility to be a little more self-reliant, self-sufficient, the opportunity to choose their own economic destiny, the opportunity to keep their own people at home instead of seeing them expatriate themselves to find employment elsewhere. It is true that succeeding governments, ours and others before, did face such problems and tried to solve them.

One only needs to consider the area of equalization payments, for instance. In the last nine years, some \$5 billion have been paid to the Atlantic provinces in order to bring the standards of their public utilities more or less up to the national level. As a matter of fact, almost one fourth of those provinces' budgets comes from equalization payments. In the last eight years, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has injected some \$1,300 million in that part of Canada to create jobs and promote industry, for an average of about \$77 per capita for the Atlantic provinces compared to a national average of some \$17.

Therefore, it is clear that successive governments have looked into this problem, but that it is yet to be resolved. Mr. Speaker, why are we hopeful on this side of the House that these problems will be resolved? Because here is now, I dare hope, a climate, a public opinion which is ready to make structural and other changes.

● (1702)

Decentralization is already well on its way through the action of my colleague, the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien), the development of energy resources, the tapping of marine and sub-marine resources, the establishment of a 200 mile off-shore limit, the federal-provincial agreement on the tapping of sub-marine resources, and I might add the increasing awareness by all Canadians of the fact that we must really provide that underprivileged part of our country with a greater equality of opportunity, something which is now evident to all of us.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark), at the Kingston Conference, which he deigned to refer to as historical, has taken up position in this respect. That is a thing, Mr. Speaker, we had proposed as early as 1971, at the Victoria Conference,