

for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Lajoie), of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. One of the happiest aspects of the debate in which we are now engaged, and there are not too many, is the opportunity which is presented to us to listen to elected representatives who remind us that all that we do here, all that the government decides in terms of policies and programs, must in the final analysis be for the benefit of the people.

While the backgrounds of the hon. member for Bruce and the hon. member for Trois-Rivières are quite dissimilar, as are their constituencies, they are much alike in the high qualifications and deep interest they bring to their work here on behalf of their constituents.

The hon. member for Bruce, a rural constituency in southwestern Ontario, has a long record of public service at the municipal, provincial and now federal levels. He served for 12 years, from 1955 to 1967, as a member of the Ontario legislature before entering federal politics in 1968, and since that date has been very active on House committees on agriculture, veterans affairs and finance, trade and economic affairs.

[Translation]

As for the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, he represents an electoral district that is mainly urban. He is somewhat of a newcomer on the political scene, since he was first elected in a by-election held in 1971. He has come to Parliament with a wealth of experience which is very useful to him here. He has been a member of the Committee on Transport and Communications and, last fall, he attended the United Nations General Assembly as an observer for Canada.

[English]

These two men have spoken in the finest tradition of this institution. They have reminded us of the concerns, the hopes and the proud accomplishments of Canadians in two distinct parts of our country. We were given an opportunity yesterday to listen to a candid appraisal of the preoccupations of our fellow citizens. We learn something of the strength of Canada through such speeches.

This morning, as the saying goes, "was something else". I found it difficult to believe that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was talking about the same country. The hon. gentleman performs much as does a badly adjusted camera filter—removing all the light and colour, leaving a dark pallor and a flatness. The effect is startling but it is scarcely realistic. I feel sorry for someone who moves in such perpetual gloom; like the unfortunate fellow whose vacation is always rained out. In time his outlook becomes quite jaded.

An hon. Member: Maybe he is a bigot.

Mr. Trudeau: Listening to him this morning, I thought of another orator and of his fate as he spoke:
There was silence supreme! Not a shriek, not a scream,
Scarcely even a howl or a groan,
As the man they called "Ho!" told his story of woe
In an antediluvian tone.

I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is totally without humour. He is certainly not without love. This morning he felt love for his own words. I noticed that he was repeating what he said in Hamilton a

Speech from the Throne

few days ago and what he said on television last night. If he repeats that speech a few more times, Mr. Speaker, his infatuation with his own talk will grow more enormous. He is not without love and certainly not without humour but I think without optimism, Mr. Speaker. For a man in his position that is understandable. Even his supporters in Toronto are so bereft of ideas to help him that they have been forced to distribute what they describe as a "non-political" tabloid. Isn't that wonderful? Non-political. Can you imagine what would happen if they ever switched to radio? We would be treated to a solemn announcement: "This has been a paid non-political broadcast sponsored by that non-political party, the non-Progressive Conservatives." It is unquestionably another first for that party. For some time it has been non-national and non-representative. Now, it is non-political as well, and by its own admission.

But we know under what difficulties the hon. gentleman labours. His policy committees struggle and struggle seeking some original programs, yet the results, always, are totally predictable. Faced with the government's proposals for the settlement of the offshore minerals dispute, this venturesome group could say nothing more than "We don't think much of it". When the government published its white paper on foreign policy, the comment was the same, "We don't think much of it". Now, even before we have spelled out our proposals for control of the Canadian economic environment, they have begun the same old refrain "We don't think much of it". So long as these unimaginative souls have their needles stuck in that single groove, I hope for his own sake that the Leader of the Opposition never asks them what they think of his own leadership record.

What was totally missing in this morning's speech, Mr. Speaker—when once the opening comedy turn was concluded—was a balanced appreciation of what is happening throughout the world. This period of history is not a tranquil backwater, and those who talk as if it were or should be, reveal that their instincts are more fitted for reminiscence than for leadership. All about us, in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, even in Europe, smouldering discontents, unrealized expectations, unresolved animosities, have burst forth in violent and tragic proportions. Concurrently, an international fiscal crisis of a dimension not witnessed in four decades has swept across the world and affected every one of the industrialized countries in varying degrees.

These are facts, Mr. Speaker. This is the reality of life on this planet in the 1970's, a reality that was forecast in the Speech from the Throne 16 months ago when we were reminded of the conflicts which could be expected in the turbulent decade of the seventies; a forecast that was airily dismissed at that time by gentlemen opposite who preferred life in their comfortable cocoons to that in the world beyond.

Canada can no more ignore these events and these pressures than it can by itself control them. We cannot live separate from others on this planet; we cannot divorce ourselves from the plight and the problems of our neighbours. But neither should we permit ourselves to follow the example of the hon. gentleman opposite and tear at our flesh and wail in self-pity.