

The Address—Mr. Trudeau

the end. The contradictions, Mr. Speaker, were about the only thing consistent in his speech.

First, we heard from the Leader of the Opposition that there was too much philosophy in the Speech from the Throne. Before he resumed his seat he complained that in the speech there was and I quote, "no general philosophy or recognizable pattern". The Leader of the Opposition does not want to see philosophy, then he would like to see philosophy, in the Speech from the Throne.

If we repeat anything that appeared in the last Speech from the Throne it is repetition, left-overs, and the Leader of the Opposition cannot agree with that. If we do not repeat things, for instance, our position on the constitution, then it is because we have lost interest in those things that we do not repeat them. If we do repeat them, we are guilty of repetition. It is a little difficult, Mr. Speaker, to completely satisfy a leader of the opposition. I realize that this is part of the rules of the game. The Leader of the Opposition is playing that game to the best of his ability. I am sure, with a certain amount of years of experience, he will learn to be quite a good Leader of the Opposition.

● (12:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: I am told some of the opposition members do not agree with the statement I have just made. But there may be further meetings across the country, in secret or otherwise, to discuss the question. The place is not here.

I was scorned because, it was said, I am not a friend of the little man, as the Leader of the Opposition put it, but rather a friend of big business. A very few phrases later I was scorned because I was poisoning the atmosphere by attacking big business and big unions. So, on the one hand, I am too friendly toward big business while, on the other, I am not friendly enough and ruining the chances of having an incomes policy.

Mr. Baldwin: Shows how inconsistent you are.

Mr. Trudeau: These inconsistencies are really not very important because no one expects a leader of the opposition to agree with what is said in a Speech from the Throne. But it is sometimes expected that there will be constructive advice in some areas and that the hon. gentleman will use this important occasion to state some of the policies of his own party. I listened attentively to the scorn heaped on us for not solving the problem of foreign ownership, expecting this would be followed up by concrete proposals. But it was a disappointing performance. We on this side have said, through the offices of a minister reporting to cabinet, that we are in the process of trying to enunciate government policy in this important area in order to avoid a pragmatic or ad hoc approach. But we knew we did not have the support of the opposition on this. They have heaped scorn on our policy of using white papers or policy documents; they have always chided us for our studied approach and the long lead-time taken before we enunciate policy on any precise matters. We have confessed we cannot speak off the top of our head on such important subjects and that we

[Mr. Trudeau.]

do not intend to lead the country to and fro according to the whims of the day. We want to have as good an enunciation as we can of our policy in this and other areas. So when the Leader of the Opposition chided us for our studied approach to this question of foreign ownership, I thought perhaps he would have finished his own studies and be in a position to say: We no longer need to study this matter; here is our solution.

We did get a number of phrases at that point, though, and no doubt they do represent good advice. I have some of the hon. gentleman's words here in quotes. After hearing him say that the government had no policy I expected that the Leader of the Opposition would tell us what he himself proposed. What he did propose was "a study", a "continuing study", certainly "nothing off the top of the head"; it would be "thought about in an orderly way"; it would be "a continuing process".

Mr. Broadbent: Sounds like the Liberal government.

Mr. Trudeau: Indeed. It sounds like what we are saying we are doing—following an orderly process. There are certainly no grounds here for chiding the government for doing what the opposition says it is in the process of doing.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad I have the agreement of the members of New Democratic party. I know they have some difficulty themselves in arriving at a policy on this question of foreign ownership. I understand they have an advantage of the Leader of the Opposition and ourselves inasmuch as they do not need to do any thinking about it. Mr. Watkins has done all the thinking. The trouble, of course, is that the party does not agree with Mr. Watkins and they are therefore in a dilemma which I do not envy them.

An hon. Member: They must miss you.

Mr. Trudeau: Either they reject Mr. Watkins, in which case it appears they, too, will have to embark on a series of studies and continuing studies, or they accept Mr. Watkins and not only the party falls apart but the union leadership ceases to support them. They are in a terrible jam.

Mr. Bell: They are in the Senate, now.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: A member opposite suggests that some of them are in the Senate. I cannot promise that I shall be able to put all the friends of the New Democratic party into the Senate but if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is interested I shall perhaps save a place there for him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Absolutely no. I decline, absolutely.

Mr. Trudeau: May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker? At one o'clock the House took recess.