

To refresh the memories of Hon. Members opposite, I would like to tell them what the Conservative record of government consists of. It consists of bank failures, tuna scandals, ministerial resignations such as you have never seen before and broken promises. I do not want to waste any time being specific about the Conservative record of government, but it was clear that what was needed for this Government was major surgery. It brought in the doctor and the nurses. Dalton Camp, Atkins *et al* were brought in at public expense as civil servants to give advice to the Government of Canada on how it could get itself out of a very serious mess. Parliament was prorogued because the Government was adrift, wallowing in a quagmire of scandal after scandal after scandal. The plug was pulled on that session of Parliament to give the Government a fresh start. That the Government should prorogue the House would suggest a recognition that something was wrong and that the Tories wanted to embark upon a new honeymoon, if you will.

While it may have been possible for the Prime Minister and the Conservative Party to hoodwink the people of Canada in the election campaign of 1984, no longer do Canadians trust the Government.

The Government in its Throne Speech talks about social justice. A Member of the government Party earlier this day made a statement that the Conservative Party is a Party with a social conscience. Really, who are the Conservatives trying to kid? There is a whole section in the Throne Speech entitled Social Justice. It is Part 4 of the Throne Speech. I challenge the Prime Minister opposite and Members of the governing Party to provide for the Opposition and for Canadians a definition of social justice and why the Conservatives think that their Party is the Party with social justice. I went to the dictionary, Mr. Speaker, and I went through some of the political material that has been written over the years to try to get an understanding of what is meant by social justice. What does the Government mean when it speaks of social justice? In order to get an understanding of what the Conservative definition of social justice is, it is important to look at the Conservative track record of Government. Let us analyse it for a moment and see what the Conservatives mean by social justice.

The Conservatives speak about deindexing senior citizens' pensions. Yes, that is a Conservative definition of social justice. If one truly believes in social justice, one does not try to deindex senior citizens' pensions. That is not just, it is not equitable and it is not fair. It was only after many weeks of national debate that the Government recognized it was unjust and it backtracked on that particular proposal. For the Government to start talking about social justice would lead one to question its credibility seriously.

Social justice, according to Mulroney—

**Mr. Malone:** Order.

**Mr. Nunziata:** —means de-indexing family allowances, which the Conservatives did. Is that fair, is it just and is it

equitable? Of course it is not when you have hundreds of thousands of single parents in Canada having difficulty making ends meet and the Government decides to take money away from them. That is not social justice. Is it social justice when the Conservative Party of Canada decides to take money away from families and those in need in the same Budget in which it gives a \$125,000 cash bonanza to the wealthy in society? That is what the Conservatives tried to do and did. Yet they have the nerve today in the Throne Speech to talk about social justice. It is not social justice. It is not economic justice. Canadians can see through the facade. If this Conservative Government thinks it can hoodwink the people of Canada on yet another occasion, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, Conservatives have another thing coming because Canadians no longer trust them. The Conservatives have frittered away the mandate given to them two short years ago.

**Mr. Berger:** Two long years ago.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Two long years ago, as my friend and colleague points out. What is left of the mandate given to the Conservative Party is but bodies in the House of Commons. The Conservative Government no longer has the mandate that it received two years ago.

We have been sitting in Parliament in this session for but a few days. We have found that the Government intends to carry on with its old ways. We know that Mr. Camp *et al* are trying to convince the boss, the Prime Minister, not to come to the House of Commons any more, to stay separate and apart, at arm's length with the House of Commons, because they fully recognize that when the Prime Minister speaks the Conservative Party is in trouble. They have looked at the public opinion polls and told him to stay away from the House. We have been told that the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) fully intends to run the nation's business on behalf of the Government of Canada. The Deputy Prime Minister was not elected by the people of Canada to carry on the functions of Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was elected for that, and he has a duty to Canadians to come to the House of Commons and be accountable for the Government and answer questions put to him during Question Period.

● (1540)

**Mr. Malone:** He has been here every day.

**Mr. Nunziata:** What we have found over the last several days is that the Prime Minister has sat on his hands. When questions are put to him, he has refused to answer. One would have thought that, given the Sinclair Stevens scandal and the attempt to stonewall on that issue, the Government might have learned a lesson. That lesson is that it is incumbent upon the Government of the day to be forthright and provide answers to Opposition questions put in this House.

Another issue which is causing the Prime Minister and the Government some embarrassment is that of the prison which will be constructed in the Prime Minister's riding. As you know, that particular maximum security institution was