

excellent economic sense. All of them we would like to see implemented, but I plead with the Government, if it is talking about economic renewal, to forget this recently acquired version of Reaganism. Look at what has happened in the United Kingdom and in British Columbia. Let it implement instead the priorities that the Prime Minister promised to the people of Canada in August when he sought the office of Prime Minister.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move from the question of economic renewal to that of co-operation. The Prime Minister has spoken often about that, and I believe that he believes it very genuinely. I say candidly that one of the pleasant aspects of the personality of the Prime Minister is that he does have a disposition to try to make friends instead of making enemies, and that is good in any nation. It is particularly good in a federal state like Canada. I also say that he is going to discover before long, whether in dealing with the Premiers or with President Reagan, that a warm handshake and a smile are not sufficient. If we want a co-operative attitude to develop in our country, it seems to me that certain basic policies, rather than just attitudes, must be implemented.

● (1700)

Consider taxation. We in my Party talked a lot in the summer campaign about taxation from the point of view of justice and fairness. It is wrong that a pensioner and a working man and woman in this land should be paying plenty of taxes when a rich person does not have to pay a cent. Certainly from the point of view of justice we should have a change which ensures that everyone pays his or her share.

I also want to recast the argument, Mr. Speaker, because it is not simply from the point of view of justice that my Party speaks about the need for tax reform. We believe in co-operation too. We believe that men and women working in the private and public sectors should have a more co-operative attitude toward one another. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister whether he would not have a much greater chance of obtaining that from working people, like IWA members, steelworkers or the many men and women in our country who are not in trade unions at all, if he said that there is going to be tax reform so that upper income Canadians will have to pay their share. Otherwise, other Canadians may ask, "Why should we co-operate? Why should we not get all we can out of the market system? Why should we have a built-in obligation to try to achieve community if those who are most able to pay are not paying a cent?" Therefore, I say to the Prime Minister that it is not simply for justice but also to develop a sense of co-operation that tax fairness is important.

I come to the issue of social justice, which was also addressed in the Throne Speech. Instead of merely giving us an agenda of the unfulfilled commitments of the previous Liberal Government, some of whose items are quite good and some of whose items men and women in all Parties of the House agree with, why did the Government not bring forward something that was really new in the justice field?

The Address—Mr. Broadbent

With regard to pensions, they are setting up a new consultative process. It makes sense to consult with the provinces about a lot of things. We have had commissions, we have had study groups, and we have had parliamentary groups. It seems to me that in the past decade we have had half the country studying pension reform. Could the Government not have said that it will begin now with some legislation to initiate pension reform?

On the subject of daycare, everyone in the country knows that the majority of women growing up now are going to be working outside the home. There has been a decisive turning point, not only in the history of Canada, but in the history of all developed societies. Some women will indeed work, get their satisfaction and make their contribution in the home, but the majority of women growing up are going to work outside the home. Anyone who has studied this problem knows very well, from either the male or female perspective, that if we are concerned about the development of children, something must be done quickly about daycare facilities. Why do we have to set up a committee of the House, as is proposed in the Throne Speech, to look into the idea of daycare? Would it not have made more sense to set up the committee on the basis that the principle of daycare is now assumed, that we are going to have it in Canada, and have that committee report back, perhaps in three months, about the methods of raising revenue in our federal system to make it a real possibility? At the same time we should introduce a minimum tax on all those who are earning more than \$50,000 a year, something which we have proposed. From that tax alone more than \$400 million in additional revenue would be raised. That money is more than adequate for the initial downpayment which has been advocated by the Canadian Daycare Advocacy Association to give a start to daycare. That is what we could do with it.

I now turn to another area of social justice, that is, the equality principle for women. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if there was an aspect of the campaign which we all lived through in the summer of 1984 which was not simply symbolic but a change of fundamental importance to the history of our land, it was the presence of women in the campaign. They were not all necessarily candidates. My Party had a lot of women, but I say frankly that we did not have a sufficient number of them in terms of what we would like in the future. I am not talking simply about the level of candidate participation. I am talking about women in our society, whether in Montreal, British Columbia, Ontario or on the Prairies. Let us put the issue of the equality of women on the political agenda of our country where it belongs.

As I read the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I read it with care, I was more than disturbed, I was deeply disappointed, because in reading that wording I found that when one got beyond the rhetoric to a consideration of the specifics, there was in fact a regression in the commitment made to women. There was a move backwards rather than forwards. I want to remind the Prime Minister of what he said in the election on the issue of fundamental importance to us, the issue of equality