

Thank you so much for that wonderful introduction and thank you to so many of you for coming today. It's a great pleasure to be here with my friends from caucus, my friend Jim Karygiannis has come from Toronto and of course Hedy and Joyce are known to everyone here. In addition we have three Members of Parliament who are online and are going to be responding to the live stream comments that are coming from people who are watching this all over the country, we hope. Rodger Cuzner, Carolyn Bennett, and Marc Garneau. I also want to recognize both Janet Austin and Karen Gilmore, both from the Y, and say that our family has a very close connection with the Y because Arlene was the co-chair of the fundraising campaign for the Elm Street housing centre in Toronto which is very exciting new centre that is opening up in our community and I'm glad to say that the fundraising was successful. We were able to reach our capital target of 15 million from the contributions in the city which was quite wonderful.

I really want to talk and focus on three themes. Three kind of central ideas which, are not new to me, they're something I've talked about a lot over my time in public life, both my time in opposition, my time in government and now of course my time as the interim leader of the party. It's something that I believe in very, very strongly as we begin to talk about issues that come under the rubric of social policy. But understand that the first thing we need to do is end the silos in our mind in the ways in which governments work in understanding the connection between social policy and economic policy, what we're doing on the environment, these things are not separate, they go together, we don't talk about one without talking about the other. I always used to say when I was in government that I would feel things were getting better when a bank president began to talk about child care and someone in a trade union started talking more and more about productivity, which is something I think is increasingly starting to happen. But it's really necessary, it's a really necessary part of the nation conversation the Liberal Party can lead. This is not a matter of one group of people having a monopoly on social policy and another group of people saying – well I don't do social policy I only do economic policy – so what is child care and what is early childhood education? Is it a social policy or an economic policy? Well it's everything. It's an economic policy because this is what allows us to develop the skilled talents of a future generation and allows us to put education at the forefront of what we're doing. It's a social policy because of what it's doing for children and what it's doing for their parents. It's a very important social and economic policy for women and for men who need to have additional assistance in terms of providing that support for families, so these things all come together.

The second is that what I've talked about, again, is something I believe in very strongly is promoting partnerships, is understanding that, if the federal government is seen as out there dictating, or coming in from the outside and saying how things need to be done, that we really don't get very far. That it's really about understanding that the country is not a series of water-tight compartments, that the provinces are not doing this and the federal government does that and they don't even have to meet and get together, although if you watch the way the Harper government operates, that's how they think. They actually think that Canada is a series of water-

tight compartments and each compartment has to do its job and just not bother the other compartment. But that's preposterous. Think about what the additional cost has been of the federal changes to the criminal code. Already we've seen 11% increase in the prison population at a time when crime is going down, and already the provinces are starting to do their homework and say wow this is going to cost us a lot of money. We have to build the prisons, many of them, we have to run them, we have to take responsibility for the court structures, we are responsible for the administration of justice under the British North America Act, so we have to pay for these things and the federal government says – not our problem, we're responsible for the Criminal Code. Well the two things go together they're not two separate things. So we really have to promote partnership, so I'll be talking a lot about this as well.

The third one is a very basic liberal principle, and that is that we embrace change, we are not afraid of change. We cannot be afraid of change as a society, as a country. So when criticise the government for what they're doing it's not because we're opposed to change, it's because we don't see the changes being constructive or we don't think they're fully taking into account the consequences of some of the changes that they're talking about. But we accept and embrace change as the working principle of the life that we are leading as a country and of the world in which we're working.

So we've invited people to come here and some have just come on their own and it's great to have a group here and we're really talking about some of the practical issue that people in the community are facing and I don't expect that the people who are either watching this, or who are listening to it, or who are here today, I don't expect you to say – I'm a passionate liberal and this is what I think – this is not what it's about. The conversation about policy has to go well beyond any particular political party we don't devise policy by saying – what do liberals think about this? – We find out – what do people think? – And what are they worried about and how do they see things going as we go forward. But there are people here who know about house, who know about addictions issues, who know about mental health problems, who know about people who haven't got places to live, people that have been largely forgotten, and people who have views about the big social demographic changes that we see going on in our country.

Je peux vous assurer que nous allons faire face à nos problèmes en parlant directement du changement parce qu'on ne peut pas avoir peur du changement parce que le changement est un aspect essentiel de nos vies. Que nous devons promouvoir les partenariats entre les gouvernements, entre les groupes sociaux, entre le secteur public, le secteur privé. Toutes ces choses ensemble sont essentielles. On ne peut pas exister dans des silos, dans des compartiments où personne ne parle pas aux autres. Et je suis très conscient que souvent les gens qui travaillent dans les provinces, surtout dans la province du Québec, on dit M. Rae écoutez ça c'est une responsabilité provinciale. Je dis oui. Mais écoutez qui est-ce qui va payer pour la santé? Comment est-ce qu'on va assurer l'avenir de notre système de santé? Oui, le gouvernement provincial a la responsabilité pour gérer le système, mais le gouvernement fédéral ne peut pas être absent. Et c'est pourquoi je dis, écoutez le gouvernement fédéral n'est pas l'ennemi de la

politique sociale. C'est un partenaire absolument essentiel pour que nous puissions arriver à un meilleur objectif. Et on ne peut pas dire que la politique sociale et la politique économique, les deux ensemble n'ont rien à faire ni l'un avec l'autre.

I want to just give you a sense of, if you'll turn your attention to the screens is just a moment. Just to give you a sense of the debate that's been going on in the Liberal Party. Some of the clips are from convention, some of them are from the House of Commons, some of them are from the debates that you may have followed. The conversation that we're not starting more aggressively, energetically if you like, with Canadians on social policy is not something that just started today it's something we've been doing. So, if I can just ask our friends to run the clips and then perhaps we can see some of the debate that's gone on.

Young Liberal -- We must about a concept of timeless freedom. The idea that we have to ensure the freedom of future generations through proactive action taken today, and this is once again composed of a heritage of both rights and responsibilities. The rights extend from intergenerational equity and sustainability. But the responsibility comes from the fact that through no effort of our own, we were born into the most fortunate of circumstances, and we have the responsibility to ensure that the same freedom of is enjoyed by future generations.

Carolyn Bennett – First Nations communities across this country are in crisis, hundreds of communities without clean running water, safe housing. The buck stops with the Prime Minister. When will he stop blaming others for this crisis and fix this Canadian tragedy?

Ralph Goodale – The formula I think, for beginning to resolve to huge life gaps between Aboriginal citizens and the rest of Canadian society, the template if you will was written by the Liberal Party and a previous government, Paul Martin's government in 2004, 2005. When we put together after 18 months of careful work with Aboriginal people, with the five nation Aboriginal organizations, we developed the Kelowna Accord, and it was real, it had a work plan, it had buy-in from 30 different government departments, it was a roadmap for the future in very tangible terms.

Kirsty Duncan – He loved his job in the military, and the loss of his job broke him. It made him lose his whole identity, today is tired of begging, grovelling for help, tired of being belittled. He says when he gets home he can't take the stress. He walks a tight rope everyday between his wife and his children. He says there isn't a day that goes by that it wouldn't be easier, just to stop. What keeps him going is a strong family life. And I'm wondering what more the Honourable Member thinks we should be doing for our veterans who are suffering with PTSD.

John McKay - One of the concerns raised by some of the soldiers was the fear that the military would not be there for them in their hour of need. Specific worries included PTSD, suicide ideation, and suicide itself. The next budget will be under severe pressure for cutting these, quote unquote, soft services. Can the minister give this house assurances that our vulnerable soldiers and their families will be protected from these budgetary pressures?

Convention Delegate – And this government’s continued importation of American style crime initiatives despite the fact that they don’t work. I’m concerned that these policies are going to have dire impacts on Aboriginal communities, our young people, our vulnerable high-risk youth.

Ralph Goodale – What does this government choose as its leading priority? Bigger jails? That seems to be their policy for affordable housing and mental health, bigger jails. That’s their policy for Aboriginal training and jobs, bigger jails. Why is it that this government is putting prisons ahead of schools? Think what that 13 billion dollars could do for education and productivity.

Irwin Cotler – Nous allons nous baser sur le principe prévention et pas le principe d’incarcération, sur le principe de réhabilitation et pas le principe d’emprisonnement.

Hedy Fry – Health as you know is a number one care for Canadians. The big thing that we’re looking at is this unilateral transfer of payments, this sloughing off of responsibility for health care and the changes that are needed to make it sustainable.

Hedy Fry – After five years of this government there is still no national home care. Will this government tell us what steps it will take to implement the wait times goal and create a national home care strategy?

Justin Trudeau – Monsieur le Président, l’entente avec les provinces sur la santé tire à sa fin dans à peine trois ans. Hors depuis longtemps déjà les premiers ministres du Québec et de l’Ontario, entre-autre, demandent en vain que ce gouvernement convoque une rencontre entre tous les premiers ministres. En effet, dans ses six au poste ce premier ministre n’a jamais tenu de rencontre formelle sur quoique ce soit avec ses homologues provinciaux. Quand est-ce qu’il va prendre au sérieux sa responsabilité en tant que premier ministre de préparer en concertation l’avenir de notre système de santé.

Dan Tapscoott – Many of our political institutions are elite, they’re cozy, and they’re an old industrial age model. How can we change that? Why doesn’t the Liberal Party do what a good government ought to do and open up and engage the rest of the world? That’s a big discussion. I read in the Toronto Star – What should be the new position of the Liberal Party? Who is going to be the new leader of the Liberal Party? – These are the wrong questions, to me. The right question is how can we change our fundamental modus operandi to engage Canada and engage the world to decide what’s the right point of view. Engage our country to decide who our leader should be. You do that and you’ll change Canadian politics forever.

That’s intended to give you a bit of flavour of the some of the issues that we’ve been raising, the things that we’ve been talking about, the concerns we have, just a word about the Liberal Party itself. You know sometimes people say – You know, the problem with liberals is that you don’t know what you stand for – and I think the thing that people are often confusing is to say well we actually have a very clear idea of what we believe in and the direction in which we think things need to go. But it’s true, we’re not slaves to any theory, we’re not captured by an ideology, we

don't start out with a position and then say now we're going go around and have a conversation about why that position is right. That's not how we engage in the political process. We engage in the political process by saying what are the challenges that we're facing and how can we deal with them effectively in a way that's likely to be successful based on the best evidence. Based on the evidence of what we know works and what we know doesn't work. And how do we actually confront some public fears and concerns, the temporary ups and downs in public opinion that go in various directions because frankly, people are not often given the information and even some of the leadership that's required to say how do we move this discussion along and get us going to where we need to get to.

So, we can just give a couple of examples. It's true the Liberal Party didn't have a policy on climate change in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Nobody did. We didn't start out by saying we weren't there then, but we did create a Dominion Parks Service and we did begin to say let's talk about how we can begin to conserve and protect some of the create resources that we have in the country, and that was a movement we were able to participate in and start, and so we can say those are the traces of our understanding about sustainable development. Although that wouldn't have been a word that even Laurier would have used to describe what he was doing when he was doing it.

Ce sont les mêmes valeurs qui nous ont amené en 1966 à créer la Loi sur le régime d'assurance-maladie et qui nous amènent aujourd'hui à demander une participation fédérale dans les dossiers catastrophiques de l'assurance-médicament et des soins à domicile.

I believe that we have to look at the health care system as an example and say we brought in a system in the sixties that dealt with doctors and dealt with hospitals. That was the insurance cost that was needed then. Well, looking around this room I'd say a great many people in this room are on drugs. I know that's the discussion that we're having these days. It's a simple reality that the most dramatically increasing, ever increasing cost in the health care system is not doctors and it's not hospitals. It is medication, and it is new technology, and it's a happy fact that we're all living longer, and the fact that we've succeeded, quite dramatically and miraculously, in changing catastrophic illness into chronic illness. Cancer was a death sentence for many, many, most people in the 1950's and 60's, heart conditions went unrecognized and unidentified, and we can all in our own lives and families think of people who died with conditions 20 or 30 years ago that today would be living if they had those same conditions. Because we've actually made dramatic progress but we haven't kept up in terms of how we provide guarantees and insurances that people get access to these services. Some provinces have better drug insurance than other provinces, some young Canadians have better access to care then other people have access to care. Some provinces have better home care results than others. B.C for example leads the way in terms of cancer care. Other provinces are catching up and trying to learn. So, a sensible federal government would say how can we share the experiences that British Columbia has had and ensure that other provinces are able to take advantage of that. Not stay back and say health care is none of my business. That's not a sensible position for the government to take.

So, our policies are changing and our policies are evolving and I think that's a critical problem. Let me just talk about two or three central issues that I have observed, I think many people have felt, we have not effectively dealt with as a country. The first one is housing, housing is what I would call an orphan. We can go back to how it was in that the 1930's and 40's that the government took a stronger role on providing leadership on housing. But we have to say that over the last 25 to 30 years, we have seen an abandonment of housing as national priority by the federal government and by most provinces. In many cases it's the cities that are taking responsibility. Calgary and Vancouver, we have exciting municipal governments, that are led by people who have ideas and progressive thoughts about how to move forward and they're saying let's deal with the homelessness crisis. Let's look at it and deal with it and find apposite solution. But, some of it can be done without the assistance of the federal government, some of it can't be, and actually most people now feel that it takes all three levels of government for this to be successfully addressed. The statistics are really quite amazing, the number of people who are inadequately housed, the number of people waiting for access to good housing, and the extent to which housing problems then become other problems. People who are living on the street have serious health issues. They usually have serious other issues, economic, personal, mental health, they all go together, they're all connected. And each level of government says not my responsibility. Somebody else has to look at this. Municipalities say, quite rightly, we don't have the money to do what we need to do. The provinces say this is a problem that is too big for us alone, and the federal government has said, as I said, for a long time this has been a steady process that we've seen the federal government simply pull back and say we're not going to do anything. In fact, when the Conservatives came to power in 2006, their first budget identified three areas in where they said the federal government was getting too involved in provincial jurisdiction; early childhood development, child care, and housing and homelessness. Well we all know what's happened in all these three areas. It's not about the federal government dictating to anyone. It's about the federal government saying we want to be a reliable partner in helping to do this, federal government has a responsibility through the Bank of Canada for interest rates, which has a lot to do with housing. Federal government has a central agency, central mortgage and housing, which has a lot to do with the whole structure of mortgages and the whole structuring of the financing of the housing market across the country. So the federal government can't pretend that it doesn't have the resources or the expertise to engage. Not to run, not to re-direct, it's not about – the federal government doesn't have to do the rowing, but the federal government can help do the steering. And that's the direction we need to see a lot more of, and I think we need a real discussion across the country about this question. About how we can get a real discussion on housing to understand that this is a huge challenge for Canada, we're not going to go back to the one size fits all, yes, expensive programs of the past. That's not what I think any sensible person would suggest. But we do need to develop a sensible policy, and yeah with a private sector, with a development agency, let's go back to all of the programs we know had some good elements, and some bad elements, and figure out how we can put something together that's actually going to work. It can be done.

You heard a little bit in the debates I think, very clearly that the Liberal Party is concerned with respect to what I consider to be a great example of unfinished business in the country. Truly unfinished, unreconciled business in the country and that is the question of the relationship of governments to the Aboriginal people of Canada. You name the statistic, education, health, housing, economic success, any statistic, and it's an embarrassment to look at them and say how could there be such a gap, such a difference? But just don't look at the statistics don't just look at the numbers. To me, what's happened in this whole area is really quite dramatic over the last half century if you think about it. It used to be we would think about Aboriginal people as living out there, which they did, they lived far away from urban centres, for the most part. So many Canadians would perhaps go their whole lives without perhaps ever seeing an Aboriginal person, a First Nations person. There have been two waves of immigration into our city over the last 50 years. One has been from other countries. We've all seen the dramatic effect of that. The other one that nobody really talks or writes about a whole lot is the other great immigration into urban centres. It has come from our own Canadian Aboriginal people moving from where they grew up and where they live to where they have now chosen to make their homes. Toronto has been described, quite rightly, as the largest reserve in the country. Whether you go to Victoria, Vancouver, name the city across the country and understand how much the make-up of the city has changed and understand that the problem is no longer out there. This problem is right here, and as it gets closer to us it also has to be closer to our hearts. An understanding of how we have not embraced Aboriginal culture, we have not understood First Nations history, we have not appreciated the loss, the indignity, and the deep sense of injustice that now has to spur us to action.

Nous devons comprendre que les questions qui n'ont pas été résolues, politiquement dans la constitution mais plus important dans nos vies. C'est la question des relations entre les gouvernements, tous les Canadiens et la population autochtone. Nous avons vu tout un changement, tout un virage dans la vie des Autochtones, des peuples autochtones. On a vu du progrès, oui, mais en même temps on doit dire que on n'est pas encore là, et que les exemples de l'injustice et des difficultés ça continue.

I just want to leave you with one thought that I had when I went to Attawapiskat, and it was not my first visit I've visited there as a premier, all the communities on the James Bay coast. Like everyone in public life I've visited many, many different communities and had many different discussions. But we went to Attawapiskat before Christmas and we visited with the band council and with the chief and looked at the finances and got a bit of the background with the discussion of the past experience with the federal government and then we went around and said let's go visit some people, and we went and visited some homes. We went and visited one home and there was a little baby girl, I still have this picture in my mind of a little girl name Caley who had just been born she was two months old and she was a beautiful baby and a healthy baby. She was asleep on a bed and her mother was next to her. I was chatting with her mother and Caley, living in a one bedroom house with no running water and no toilet and her mother has to go outside in

order to go to the washroom, and I thought to myself - What sort of future is this young girl going to have? Now when she grows up she'll be watching TV like children across the country with the one distinction that the television will describe a life of which she knows absolutely nothing. She'll go to a school where she will have difficulty speaking her own language because she won't have any teachers who will understand her language, and one thing that's striking particularly in the isolated areas in the North is the extent to which Aboriginal languages are still widely spoken, and widely shared, the language of conversation, and she'll be going to school and the teachers will come and go, they will come up from the South for a year then they'll go back, and she'll have an experience where if she goes to high school, she'll probably have to leave the community to go to high school or stay in the community, not sure, results mixed and parents will make their choices. There are more kids today across the country who are now in foster care and are being taken away from their communities than was the case during the residential community time. We all decided, governments decided that it was better for everyone for kids to leave their communities and that would be a better chance for them to assimilate and connect. Folks this is a huge issue and many young Aboriginal people, they'll leave, they'll say this isn't going to work for me I have to go, and she'll struggle and she'll try to make it in Timmins or Sudbury or in Toronto or where ever and the examples, there are thousands, tens of thousands of little Caley's across this country. What are we going to do as a country? What have we got to say about this? It isn't about a photo op it isn't about a meeting with a few people that will last a couple of hours, it's not about announcing that we're going to turn the page, whatever the heck that means. We have to do more than turn a page here, we have to come to grips with this as a country. Because the anger that implodes and leads to self-destruction and suicide which is such a challenge and such a problem in so many places, and so many communities across the country, that anger can explode too, and people who think well this is not an issue, if you look at the Conservative crime agenda and you look at the forces that are behind it, it has so much to do with how people are living today in our cities. Every city now has an Aboriginal ghetto and there are places that people say, you know, don't go there, don't walk down that street. We can't turn our backs on this folks we can't walk away from this and say if we just build more jails that will solve the problem. The trouble is, liberals, any sensible person who looks at this issue will say, they've actually tried that in a whole bunch of different countries. You look at South Africa, you look at New Zealand, you look at Australia, you look at the United States. We are all wrestling with this question. Of the relationship of people who came earlier and people who came later. There's no other way to describe it. Nobody has gotten it right yet, we've made progress in some areas and not in others. But to think that we can just sort of keep doing what we're doing and say, we're fine, we're good, we have no problem, same thing's true with mental health, we've buried this problem for so long, nobody ever wanted to talk about it. Every family in the country has been affected by mental health issues, every single family. There isn't a soul around that hasn't either been affected by it themselves or had members of their family that have been affected by it, and yet we don't really engage with it as a problem, we think well there's no solution to it, perhaps if we encourage people to buck up and feel better that will solve the

problem. We're sending young people over to Afghanistan asking them to engage in the most traumatic of conflicts, which they've done loyally for the past decade and many of them come back 40% suffering from PTSD. Not just the soldiers, young civil servants who are going out, coming back and finding themselves crying at a desk and no one can understand what's wrong. Is there some sort of problem you've got? You say yeah I've been living with this stress that has built up in my life for two or three years wondering if the next ride I took in a car was going to be my last ride, yeah, I've got a lot of issues, and again, we are the ones, we are the one as a party that needs to ask the question, how are we going to deal with this problem? Every province has gone through the change of saying the answer to mental health problems is to incarcerate people. Someone is seriously ill we'll put them in a mental institution. In Ontario there used to be three huge, huge, big, large Victorian institutions that were there for people not so much for people who had mental health issues but people who had developmental health issues. And then we said okay we're going to begin allowing people into the communities, and there were all sorts of reactions to that. But in the case of mental health we shut down the largest institutions across the country, every province.

Toutes les provinces ont fait la même chose, c'est la même chose au Québec, en Ontario on a fait exactement la même chose avec la question de la santé mentale mais le problème qu'on a, c'est que on a dit aux gens, oui on peut vous donner des drogues on peut vous donner des traitements et vous serez mieux dans la communauté. Mais on ne peut pas le faire sans appui, sans abri, sans travail. C'est une recette pour le désastre que nous voyons, ce n'est pas le désastre seulement dans une province ou une autre, c'est un défi national. C'est un défi que nous partageons.

These are, these are shared experiences for Canadians and it isn't good enough to say these are provincial issues and these are federal issues. It just doesn't work for us as a country to say that. And we've seen in the last little while the conversation that Harper has been having with the provinces. It's not really a conversation. It's more like a kind of monologue. It's Mr. Harper's monologue with the provinces. This is what we're doing on health care, good luck. He announced in Davos, he announced in Davos that they've now solved the health care problem in Canada because the federal government understands the need to control federal health care costs. They've solved that problem, and now they say they're also going to solve the problem of people getting older. We're just going to start carrying out comprehensive pension reform. You know what I love about that one is, he had a whole election campaign in which he could have told Canadians, I have a grand plan, you've seen it in the Globe and Mail, I have a grand plan, why did he have to go to his alpine perch to tell us about his grand plan? Why couldn't he have done it during the election campaign? And say, we're going to raise the retirement age, but then just take this very specific issue of old age pension and he says it's a federal issue, it's not a federal issue, only, think of the impact this will have on the provinces. You change the age at which people can qualify for old age pension and guaranteed income supplement and think for a moment the impact it will have on the entire provincial welfare system. Think about it. There are Canadians who are in their late 50's and early 60's who are not able to get back into the

workforce, who cannot qualify for CPP, if I can just get technical for a moment, they don't qualify for Canadian pension disability, they're not receiving support from anybody except for the provincial welfare department and they will finally get a slightly better standard of living when they're 65, and the provinces can say – Ah. But now we're saying to people, well, could be 66, could be 67, could be 68, could be 69. So we're basically saying to those older people who have great difficulty attaching again to the labour force, you're on your own. And we're saying to the provinces – Ha – we're dumping that cost back on you, and this is what is so wrong about the way that the country is being run at the moment. It's not the right way to do things. The country is a partnership. The federal government has always been present. At the great moments in our history whether it's on housing or health care, the federal government has been present and said we're going to come forward and we're going to address these questions, and we're going to work with the provinces. Yes the conversation is a long one. Yes it's messy and yes you have arguments and you have debates and you have discussions. You have premiers who say this and you have premiers that say that and the Prime Minister rolls up his sleeves and says this is the way we're going to do things. That is how Paul Martin did the Kelowna Accord. They were all there, rolling up their sleeves and dealing with it. It took 18 months to get there. There was nothing pristine about it. The federal government wasn't flying at 50,000 feet looking down at people and saying how are you doing? This is the problem we now have. Mr. Harper could have done it very differently he could have talked about the federal government leading on a national health strategy. Instead of which he's adopted a very different approach. We used to have co-operative federalism we used to have executive federalism. We now have what I call dictatorial federalism. It's my way or, too bad, you're on your own. When you think of how the world is changing, those of you who can get on to liberal.ca, the whole conversation Dan Tapscott was having, saying how politics is changing, it's collaborative it's about listening, it's about changing it's about saying how do we do this policy how do we do that policy, how do we engage in a national conversation, how do we get people to come to a considered judgement? When I think to myself, what government is actually the complete opposite of all of these things, in terms of how all the new technologies should change the way we communicate, this is the most command and control, we will tell you what to do, if you don't agree with us we will pillory you and victimise you and we will argue with you. I mean, this is a real challenge for Canadians, because yes you know, the world is changing. We can't take prosperity for granted. But we need to think of a way that we can create genuine working partnerships to address the issues that we need to address, and it is going to involve people from all sorts of different walks of life and backgrounds and points of view and perspectives and it is going to mean that the people we need to talk to about how we are actually going to change the situation in our cities the people who are living and working in our cities and the people who are living and working in our reserves are going to tell us this is the problem we have and this is what we need to do to solve it. It seems to me that is not the current style and way in which good politics and good social policy is being created.

So we face a big challenge as a country. Those who say that we can't take prosperity for granted are absolutely right. We can't take it for granted. But we also can't take for granted that the prosperity that is being created is properly shared and we can't take it for granted that it's being carried on a basis that is sustainable. And this is a situation in which the adjectives are just as important as the nouns. We all want prosperity, but it has to be widely shared and it has to be sustainable. It seems to me that that is the real challenge we face today as a country. Whatever the policy issue may be the style with which we approach it has to be very consistent and it has to be one that says we embrace partnerships, we will end silos and we will end compartments and we will end dictation from the top and we will end this top down approach to how we solve every problem. We insist on respecting jurisdiction yes, but we insist on embracing the changes that need to be made together and understanding what that together actually means for Canadians.

Finally just to say to everybody here and anybody who is listening is that, if you think for example that the crime policy has got it wrong, that putting more people in jail, actually raising the incarceration rate by 11% in one year, you want to talk about uncontrollable costs Mr. Harper? You want to talk about costs which are going to go through the roof? That's one you've just created all on your own because the crime rate is actually going down. As the crime rate falls we put more people in jail. Can you explain to me the logic of that, how it works? Do people feel safer as a result of that? No, we're not preventing anything we're not making things safer. But if you feel that we're going in the wrong direction today and that we need to turn a page and move in a different and better direction, then it seems to me that we in the Liberal Party have a job to do to persuade you to help us participate in this process.

Si vous partagez le point de vue que j'ai exprimé, c'est-à-dire que la direction sociale du pays n'est pas égale à ce que nous devons et ce que nous pouvons faire, et si vous partagez avec moi le sentiment qu'il faut créer des partenariats, il faut mettre fin aux silos, et il faut comprendre que le changement est là, et c'est inévitable et que nous ne pouvons pas rejeter le changement, alors je vous invite, si vous voulez, de devenir militants du Parti libéral, mais c'est pas exigé. Je vous invite à participer dans le processus de discussion et dans la conversation nationale qui est essentielle, et dans le développement de la politique et de la plate-forme du Parti libéral du Canada parce que je pense que ça va aider la situation.

We're not asking, well I'm happy to ask, please, if you want to join you can join the Liberal Party. But I'm not insisting on it as a pre-condition. What in fact what we said at our last convention was if you simply want to participate in this conversation all you have to do is join it and we're not putting up any walls or barriers or anything else. One last word I want to say, and this is not scripted and it may get me into trouble but I'm going to say it anyway. One of the pieces I've read today, naturally I read the piece in the Globe and Mail, and there was one comment by Michelle Landsberg who is the wife of Stephen Lewis, who Stephen quoted her

saying “You know, Bob Rae, he was never really one of us”. And I thought about that for a minute and I said, you know what, that actually is a description of why I’m so happy to be a liberal. Because to be a liberal, you don’t have to be one of us all you have to do is want to be an open, thinking, thoughtful person. We’re not a religion, we’re not a doctrinally based group, we’re not an ideology, we’re not a party that puts up barriers and says if you can’t cross that line you’re not one of us, we’re not one of those people who says if you can do this this way you’re not one of us, if you’re one of those people who says well I want to look at this again because I’m not sure the way we were doing it before was working they say well if you do that you’re not one of us. I’m very happy to say I’m a Canadian first, I’m a human being first, yes I’m a liberal, I’m a liberal because I believe this is the best way for us to create the best policies for this country. I respect the opinions of others and I respect other political parties. I take nothing away from any of them except to say if you want to help us create a stronger, better, more socially just and truly, deeply sustainable country whose prosperity is not purchased at the price of social justice or at the price of environmental sustainability, then please join us in this conversation. Thank you very much.