

St. John's West on a Saturday morning, on a CBC radio program, say that when he comes back to power and is Minister of Finance he will have to give it serious consideration. Why is he considering? When asked how he would cut the Budget and cut spending rather than the deficit, he turned immediately Pavlovian in his concept to say: "We will have to give serious consideration to introducing a means test", not for family allowances, although he mentioned that, not for many of the other fringe expenditures and social policies, but for the old age pension.

I have to give the Hon. Member credit. At least he is clearing the road. He is clearing the debris. He is bringing back, helping to clarify and sharpen the policies of the Conservative Party as opposed to the policies of the Liberal Party. He is making it quite clear for the electorate in six or eight months, or whenever the time may be for an election, to say let's get away from personalities; let's get back to issues, let's get back to policies.

What are the clear distinctions between the Liberals, Conservatives and New Democrats? Every time they come under that scrutiny the New Democrats simply disappear. The 12, 13 or 14 per cent of the population, appealing mostly to intellectuals who can afford those socialist tendencies and those who are indoctrinated in the policy and their own basic philosophy, cannot realize the extent to which the world is changing.

We are now understanding the Conservative policy. It is now emerging, slow but sure, day by day. When you strip the front pages of the personalities, the leadership, who will be this, who will be that, policy differentiation is emerging. That is good for Canada. It is good for the Tory Party. If the majority of Canadians want a government that is dedicated to bringing in means tests for old age pensions, one which thinks President Reagan is the greatest invention since sliced bread, that our policies must be a reflection of neo-conservatism in this country, they can at least see that the issues are not blurred, that they are distinct. They will see the Liberal Party remains faithful to the concept that the government has a role to play in protecting the less fortunate, the helpless, those with no organized union, the 66 per cent of the workers in this country who through no fault of their own, and perhaps through their own fault, are unable to cope and meet the day to day expenses that people incur.

Is that a legitimate role for a government to play? I have to say it is. If I did not think so, I would be over knocking on the door of my good friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney). Whenever the industrialized world is under pressure for money, as it has been for the last few years, these strains are bound to emerge. Liberalism has been the marriage of an economic policy that does not differ all that much from the Conservative Party with social reform. Where we do differ from the Conservative Party is in our social concepts, our conscience, our concern, our compassion, our care for people. We are not a cold, efficient organization. We are not the disciples of Adam Smith. We believe in compassion and concern. That is why we favour transfer payments to extremes in this country, unlike the Americans. That is why we are

The Budget—Mr. Mackasey

dedicated to seeing that everybody has equal opportunity by funding universities and other schools of education, and making medicare possible so that everybody has a chance to be healthy and to be educated. Without health, you can be nothing. These are the fundamental things that distinguish us from the Conservatives.

The Budget also points out certain ways that we differ from the New Democrats. We believe that social policies can only come from increased productivity. Money does not come from Heaven, it comes from private enterprise. We believe in free enterprise. The NDP have an open invitation. Any time they want me to join their Party, they can tell me one single society in this world that I would trade for the Canadian way of life. Name it. They can't. They are silent. I have been issuing that challenge for 20 years. Will it be Sweden where you wait eight years, not to buy a home but to rent a home? Would it be Poland? Would it be Russia? Would it be Cuba? Where is it? They may have the right political doctrine for a country at a certain stage of its emergence, but we are well beyond that. This country is well beyond the doctrine of the New Democratic Party.

How do we increase productivity? I share with my friend in the corner his concern for the labour movement. I do not believe that the adversarial concept can ever be legislated out of existence. There is no country that can export its labour-management concepts, be it Japan or wherever. We have a system that has worked remarkably well.

What the NDP do not realize, or perhaps they do, is the tremendous change in the composition of the work force. Not too long ago four workers out of five were so-called blue collar workers. Today three out of five are white collar workers. They are educated. They are intelligent. They do not want to be dominated by a union leader who says you have to walk down Main Street on May Day. They do not even understand the connotation. They want to be amply compensated. They do not even need a toolbox any more. They are "knowledge workers" rather than skilled workers.

This is the computer generation. It has been going on for a long time, certainly as long as I can recall. These changes are subtle and bring about a change in attitude. These workers know the need to co-operate. They know the need to sit down with management. They know the advantages to management, to labour and to the free enterprise system of increased productivity. They ask only that they get their fair share of that increased productivity. An enlightened and realistic management understands that as well. I am quite optimistic about the growth of labour, management and government co-operation in the future which will create jobs and increase our productivity.

● (1220)

We will never destroy or eliminate the adversarial role of labour and management. However, it will become the exception, just like strikes of any serious nature will become the exception rather than the rule in the future. This will not be because government has determined that by a piece of legisla-