

during the last weeks and months, and an explosion of public furor when the truth was brought before us, not by the Throne Speech but by the media, that the Government finally recognized that there are real problems which must be addressed. I am happy to see that today some positive action is being taken.

What of nuclear war, Mr. Speaker? Oh, the speech did make references to nuclear war, several times. But it did not deal with the magnitude, nor the gravity or urgency of the problem. It did not specify what action Parliament would be asked to undertake, either by way of moral or political action. It did not give us a policy direction on a nuclear freeze, on suffocation, on arms reduction or initiatives for inspection, or on diplomacy. To do that would have broken the spell that the mood manipulators over there want to create. They do not want problems and issues to be mentioned, they just want us to feel good.

I could cite many more such major global problems. Canada, the second largest nation on earth, a strategic continental nation facing three oceans, the Pacific, the Arctic and the Atlantic, has reason to be concerned about such global problems. It is because this Government wants to continue to manipulate our minds with images rather than facts, because it wants us all to feel good in a Tory world, that it did not want the Throne Speech to talk about such disturbing and touchy issues as our ecology, our survival on this planet, the economic problems of the Third World, and the impact of the technological revolution on our older people, our younger people and our national independence. We should not be surprised that the Throne Speech skirted all of these problems and issues which are most important to Canada and to this House of Commons.

Here was a moment in history that was lost. It was a cowardly, evasive and empty speech when humanity was crying out for greatness. It was a damnable betrayal of the weak and despondent of this world who are listening and waiting for just an inkling of understanding, a ray of compassion, a word of hope. It was not a speech worthy to be delivered from the throne of a sovereign who reigns over a commonwealth that spans the world and comprises hundreds of millions of people. It was, rather, a speech from a small-minded, mean and self-centred leadership that would not recognize greatness if it fell into it. The speech was not a bang, it was a whimper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments on the Hon. Member's speech?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, while not subscribing to all the rhetoric the Hon. Member used, I certainly share some of his concerns about things that were missing in the Throne Speech. However, I do get by implication the feeling that the Government of which the Hon. Member was a supporter prior to September 4 was apparently meeting and responding to many of these challenges which he feels the new Government is not doing. That does not correspond with all of my recollection of facts. Can the Hon. Member comment on the failure of the Trudeau Cabinet and Turner Cabinet to respond to the urgent

entreaties of the then Minister of Agriculture, who had visited Ethiopia and, in his role as President of the World Food Council, knew what was happening months before the Ethiopian famine situation came to the attention of the world through the media in the last few weeks?

In addition, the Hon. Member indicates, rightly, the failure of this Government to respond to the need for a nuclear freeze and for Canada to take a lead in getting the nations of the world to agree to a cessation of the build-up of nuclear weapons, both in the East and the West. He seems to imply that that was a policy of the former government, and that is distinctly in contradiction with my recollection. In fact, I seem to recall that even though the wife of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) indicated her support for that particular proposal, and even though the President of the Liberal Party of Canada indicated her support as well, even though we were told from his bed and his pillow that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) favoured that particular proposal, it never became his policy while he was Prime Minister of Canada.

I would just like the Hon. Member to comment perhaps on those points because it seems to me that his recollection is perfectly at odds with the policies that were adopted by his Party when it was in power. In fact, I think most of the Hon. Member's comments with respect to the new Government would have applied equally cogently to the old government.

Mr. de Corneille: Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the observations of my colleague. His comments, it seems to me, were addressed really to the past and to what happened before.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dick: What did not happen before! Nothing.

An Hon. Member: Abandon the record.

Mr. de Corneille: Well, I would be pleased to run on that record.

Mr. Dick: You did.

Mr. Benjamin: You did and look what happened.

Mr. de Corneille: That is why I am here, that is right, and I am glad that I am here in fact to give witness to those same concerns that were expressed in the House. The concerns about nuclear war, for example, and the efforts made by the previous Prime Minister in this respect have certainly set an example for the world. This country's example concerning the famine in Ethiopia, as witnessed by the Right Hon. Member today, and Canada's record over the past year and years, is the finest in the world. I really do not think I am going to apologize for that.

What I was addressing myself to, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that here was a great opportunity. We are supposed to have a change, we are supposed now to be looking forward to the future, to the 21st century. A vast mandate was given to that Party, and I am simply expressing my grave amazement and