

equality, principles which are basic to Liberal philosophy. This will be a Liberal government on the move.

● (1710)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: Oh, boy. Who wrote that?

Mr. Trudeau: I commend the Leader of the Opposition on his speech, which was short and to the point. I only regret that, short as his speech was, he took considerable time in licking partisan wounds. The time for action is now. The next four or five years will be years of solid Liberal achievement on behalf of the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: At the outset of my speech I invited opposition members to contribute to that achievement with hard work and constructive advice; and, who knows, they might get used to the phenomenon of forward movement and even enjoy the movement.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, before commenting on the dissertations we have heard, I wish to pay tribute to a distinguished Canadian, the present leader of the New Democratic Party, the former member for York South, David Lewis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: No man has worked more ably and diligently in this House and outside for the building of an independent Canada in which our citizens can live in social and economic equality. I can think of no higher praise for a Canadian politician. I am sure I speak for all members of this House in wishing him well in his new contribution to Canada as a professor of political science at Carleton University.

It would have been interesting to note the reactions of certain people if they could have been here this afternoon to listen to the Prime Minister's speech. For example, Nero, if he had been here, would have been embarrassed. Professor Laski would have failed the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as a student, and the Canadian people, if they had all been present, would have been thoroughly disenchanted. Consider the subjects which came before the House in this afternoon's question period. They included the fate of Canada's Indians, 25 per cent of whom live in housing unfit for human beings. Questions were raised about starvation throughout the world. A member of the Conservative party, by way of a question, initially brought attention to the fact that housing starts in Canada, on a yearly basis, have declined by 60,000 units.

A question was asked about the 28 million eggs which, through maladministration, were deliberately allowed to go rotten. It was brought to our attention that milk will increase in price by five cents a quart. This will affect the nutrition of many people, particularly of children whose families are poor. Questions were raised about pensions and about energy. We know that the unemployment rate in Canada is extremely high. According to forecasts, by next spring it may run at about 8 per cent, which will be the highest rate of unemployment Canada has seen in 13

The Address—Mr. Broadbent

years. We also know that inflation in Canada now runs at 11.5 per cent. All this came before the House. To his immense credit, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) tried substantially to deal with these subjects. He recognizes that these are the issues which concern the people of our country.

But what did the Prime Minister talk about? He talked about bilingualism, and I agree that that subject is important.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Apart from that, what did he say for one hour and ten minutes? In a general way he talked about the theory of democracy. Seriously, if he were a first year student of mine and came forward with such rubbish, I would fail him. Then he talked about parliamentary reform and Senate reform, and gave a general description of dominion-provincial relations. After that he talked about constitutional amendments. He raised five subjects which do not affect even .05 per cent of the people of Canada, and spent one hour and ten minutes lecturing us on them. That was disgraceful.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: The Prime Minister went to the people of Canada on July 8. In my view, he conveyed the impression that he cared emotionally for the welfare of our people, particularly of working families. He dealt with wage and price controls. I agree with what he said. I think such controls are harmful. I respect the integrity of the Leader of the Opposition. I think his judgment is wrong on that issue, but he argued it with conviction. I also thought the Prime Minister argued out of conviction. It seemed that he was concerned about poverty in our country and about inflation and he wanted to do something about them.

What did we get today? In all seriousness, I think we saw a rerun of a 1968 movie. Compare the speech given to the House after the 1968 election with the one given this afternoon and you will find the same subjects discussed, the same general talk and the same lack of concern about what is bothering people in Vancouver, in St. John's, in the north or on the prairies. The Prime Minister gave us no indication to show that this country's real problems matter very much to him.

I now intend to speculate on where the government intends to go. The speech we heard this afternoon shows the government's general economic philosophy. It shows how it intends to deal with those issues. It is clear from the Speech from the Throne and from two recent speeches delivered by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) that the government intends to deal in the coming months with at least one issue—inflation. It is also clear that it is moving to the kind of deflationary policy which was pursued with disastrous results in the 1969 to 1971 period.

An hon. Member: There is no evidence of that.

Mr. Broadbent: The minister says there is no evidence of that. The allegation is serious and I will try to give my reasons for it.