

*The Address—Mr. Trudeau*

with unemployment and the economy, "let the market forces and the private sector solve it". If there is a problem in energy, "let the multinationals solve it". If there is a problem in co-operative federalism, "let the provinces solve it". This, Mr. Speaker, is government by abdication. This is really admitting that somehow the Government of Canada is not called upon to solve the problems. If it were just a kind of sad comment on the frame of mind of the Conservative Party, well, I would say it is a sad comment. But it is more serious than that. If we are going to let the private sector and the provinces solve the problems; or if it is a world problem, let the United States solve it; if we are going to let the United States, the private sector, the provinces, the market forces, if we are going to let the past settle all the problems as was the case with the Crow when they said let us not do anything for another three years, it has been there almost 100 years—

[*Translation*]

That reminds me of Molière's character who blindly endorsed the opinions of the elders. For him, it was a virtue.

[*English*]

What is the result, Mr. Speaker? Not just impotence of the Government of Canada but survival of the fittest.

What we have in the Tory Party is a return once again to the 19th century. What they would bring back is political and social Darwinism. If you let the provinces solve a problem, you can be sure it is the tough and stronger provinces which would take over from the others. If you let the market solve the problem in every case, in every circumstance, obviously it will be the strong who will take hold over the weak. If you let the United States solve all the problems, obviously little countries like Canada and Europe and the rest of the world cannot have much say. That, Mr. Speaker, is social Darwinism and that is why I say the Leader of the Opposition is taking us back to the 19th century. That is basically the difference between that Party and this Party. I hear a Tory over there saying "that is right". I am glad they have understood this.

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

**Mr. Trudeau:** I think I must refer to a newsletter put forth by Mr. Peter Blaikie in November, 1982. It has been made public and we saw it reproduced in the newspapers and so on. It gave a profile of the delegates to the Tory convention. That was a masterpiece of social Darwinism, Mr. Speaker. You look at the profile of the delegates to the Tory convention and you find, for instance, that 75 per cent of all the delegates are against affirmative action for women or minority groups. So when the Leader of the Tory Party talked this morning about the plight of women, the unemployed and other such, we have to know there is going to be no affirmative action to help them out of that plight.

We see that 65 per cent of the delegates to that convention were opposed to increasing not just old age pensions but the guaranteed income supplement, for gosh sakes! And family allowances. And putting more money into medicare, in spite of the words of the Leader of the Opposition this morning. It is

easy to see why that Party is against the CIDC, why it is against Crown corporations, Canadair and CIDA. Yes, that is another quote from Blaikie's newsletter, that 65 per cent of Tory supporters were against increased aid to Third World countries. It is all very well to talk about commiseration and the barefoot boy who saw what it was to slug away and whose dad worked so hard. All these are nice things and we see the problems; but what are the solutions?

This Party put forward a Speech from the Throne. Admittedly it was not the greatest thing that any God could have dreamt up in His paradise, but it was an honest attempt to put forward solutions to the problems of the day. The mover of the motion in support of the address, the Hon. Member for London West (Mr. Burghardt), and the seconder, the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde), made honest speeches. They did not try to be buffoons for the first third of the time allocated to them. They were not trying to imitate, not Cecil B. De Mille but poor imitations of Laurel and Hardy, I suppose. They were making serious contributions to the debate. They were saying what they saw in the speech for their riding, what they saw for the country, how they thought it would improve things. Once again I would have thought the people of the country would have had some expectation to get this from the Leader of the Tory Party, but they do not know that the Tory Party is essentially a coalition of the "antis". They do not know that the Tory Party, when it says it is time for a change, does not want to bring us into the 21st century; they want to bring us back into the 19th century, and they say so in their policies.

I was trying to jot down some of the subjects raised by the Leader of the Opposition this morning and wondered if I could take a few of them to try by induction to see what principles of action lay behind the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition here on previous occasions. He told us that unemployment is a terrible thing, which it is. He said this country needed jobs, which it does. He criticized the amounts that our various ministries are putting into job creation as not being enough. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) in his last budget put some \$2.4 billion into bringing forth works off the shelves to create an infrastructure for progress in this country; another \$2.4 billion went in tax incentives of various kinds.

The Leader of the Opposition this morning still found a way of telling us that taxes should still be cut. Admittedly, he is a good spokesman for most Canadians because no one likes paying taxes. But if we look at the report issued by the Department of National Revenue just about a year ago, we will see that comparatively Canadians, whether it be as private individuals or members of the corporate sector, pay taxes no higher and generally somewhat lower than people in the United States.

But never mind, we know from the Tory Party that when they talk about creating jobs, they also keep in mind the deficit. One thing that some of their spokesmen have said is the first thing they would do is to cut the deficit. Others have said they would cut taxes. One way or another there will be less money left for the Government to create jobs, particularly