

Supply

Mr. Roberts: What does the Hon. Member really mean by "socialization"? It is hard to know. He certainly does not seem to understand what the word means. Perhaps he means that this Government, this Party, is committed to social reform, that we do believe we can help.

I apologize, I did not mean to be so harsh. That the Hon. Member could not stand it; that he had to leave the House. However, if he thinks this is bad, wait until my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) goes after him this afternoon.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do believe that Government can help society by providing a basic structure of social protection. If that is his accusation, then we are guilty. We are not only guilty, we are proud. We in this Party and this Government are proud that we have been responsible for building the basic structure—

Mr. Taylor: That is why you are way down in the polls.

Mr. Roberts: —of social protection.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: We do believe that society should care not only for the rich and the self-important. We do believe that society should care and that Government can help those who are not fortunate in a society. We do believe in those things.

Yes, we were responsible for Family Allowances; guilty. Yes, we believe in old age pensions; guilty. Yes, we support the Unemployment Insurance Program which, in these days, has shown how important and valuable it can be to a country in a period of recession. Yes, we are proud that we brought in medicare; guilty. Yes, we believe in Guaranteed Income Supplements; guilty. Yes, we support the Canada Assistance Program; guilty. If that is what the Hon. Member means by "socialization", then we are guilty.

It is odd, though, Mr. Speaker, to realize that these programs we brought forward, that "socialization", were fought by that Party opposite. The Conservatives fought these programs when they were introduced. They do not fight them now, however, not in specifics. They do, of course, with their windy rhetoric but not in specifics.

I would like to welcome the Hon. Member back to the House. I promise not to say anything too unkind about him from now on.

Mr. Mazankowski: I just had to take a phone call, and they agreed with everything I said.

Mr. Roberts: One has only to look at that Party's leading candidates, and perhaps I should not say this to the Hon. Member because he has not the courage to support any of the candidates for the Progressive Conservative leadership. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, "lacking in courage", is not a parliamentary expression. Perhaps I should say he has the good sense not to support any of the Progressive Conservative candidates for leadership. However, you do not find those leaders attacking these programs. Mr. Mulroney is not opposing medicare. The Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) is not opposed to Family Allowances. The Hon. Member for

St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) is not opposing old age pensions. Oh, no. With rhetoric, yes, they are against "socialization", but they are not against those programs. Perhaps they do not understand why those programs are good. However, what they do understand is that the Canadian public needs them and wants to have them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roberts: Perhaps what that Party is talking about with "socialization" is economic socialism. Maybe that is the ragtag they are trying to stick to our image. In that case, they do not have very long memories, do they, Mr. Speaker? They forget that it was Liberal Governments with Louis St. Laurent and C. D. Howe which established the basic, tremendous growth and structure of economic development in Canada. Is that the kind of intervention which they are opposed to in their resolution?

They do not have very short memories, either. Is it because we stand for some sort of "socialization" that the recent budget brought forward by my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), was applauded by virtually all-business people—small business, large business, medium-sized business? Is the investment tax credit socialization? Is the special recovery refundable tax credit socialization? Is the special recovery share-purchase tax credit socialization? Is the special recovery investment fund socialization? Is the special recovery exports financing fund socialization? If that is "socialization", then the country is certainly going to benefit from that kind of approach to our economic problems.

This motion rejects "interventionist policies". That Party is against intervention. It is wonderful to listen to the Hon. Member. His speeches ring out across the land. Who can forget those marvellous attacks against Premier Lougheed for the purchase of Pacific Western Airlines? Who can forget his astringent comments against the Conservative Government of Ontario for the purchase of Suncor and for their involvement with Ontario Hydro? Who can forget his flaming attacks against the retroactive appropriation of trust companies? Oh, yes, he is against intervention. Every day we hear the Hon. Member speak out against such intervention as the Canadian Wheat Board, for instance.

Every day I listen to the comments of his colleagues. For instance, in my own area of responsibility, when we talk about forestry policies in this House of Commons, his colleagues seem to be always asking me to do less in forestry. They seem to be always suggesting we could get by without doing as much, that we do not need more, that we should not be more active. That is what his colleagues seem to be saying all the time. Nonsense. He should talk to his seatmates. They are pushing and pressing the Government to do more and more in the forestry area.

Mr. Taylor: More for the people. Less for the Liberals.

Mr. Roberts: In science and technology, for which I used to have some responsibility, of course, his colleagues are saying to