

*Unemployment*

by inserting therein, immediately after the words "a long-term program", the following words: "of public investment and economic development".

The words which have been included in that subamendment have already been approved by members of this party in their statements during this debate. They are words taken precisely from the documents which were before the dominion-provincial conference of 1945 and were approved in principle by all the governments attending at that time. For that reason, so far as these words are concerned, we naturally support their addition. They have already been used by members of this party during the course of the debate. I wish to leave no doubt, however, in supporting these words in the exact form in which we ourselves have put them forward that we are certainly not putting any interpretation upon them other than the careful interpretation which was put on them at the time they were accepted, approved and put forward.

I say that for this reason. The hon. member who spoke just before me spoke about the 600,000 unemployed in the name of free enterprise. I wish to leave no uncertainty about the fact that we subscribe to no such comment as that in relation to this debate. The 600,000 unemployed are not unemployed in the name of free enterprise. Nor would I wish to leave any suggestion that I approve of such a statement as the one to the effect that we do not want to hear any clap-trap about liberty. We want to hear a great deal about liberty, and a discussion of liberty is not clap-trap at any time.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that in supporting a subamendment which contains words with a specific meaning which we ourselves have approved in exact terms on earlier occasions, we most certainly are not accepting any of the doctrinaire interpretations which may be put upon them by hon. members to the left, nor are we subscribing to any suggestion that a discussion of liberty is clap-trap or that 600,000 people are unemployed in the name of free enterprise.

I had not thought of entering into a discussion of the politics of any other country, but I cannot help recalling that when a good dose of real free enterprise was given to the people of Britain a couple of years ago, immediately there was a response which manifests itself today in the greatest spirit I have seen in Britain for many long years. I make that observation because it would not be well to leave any impression that the doctrinaire policies which have received some support in this chamber on certain occasions find approval here.

In view of the fact that I feel impelled to comment on this statement, may I also comment on something else. I would regret very much if the reports are correct that the Right Hon. Clement Attlee is coming to this country to speak on behalf of or at meetings arranged by a political party in this country. I recall over the years that when Lloyd George came here he firmly refused to take part in anything that savoured of political discussion in this country, and the same has been true of leading members of other parties.

There are obvious reasons why it is highly desirable that those who occupy positions such as that of Mr. Attlee should not engage directly or indirectly in the political activities of another nation within the commonwealth. I feel at liberty to make this statement, and I make it of a man for whom I have the highest admiration, a man I have had the privilege of counting as a friend for some years. I would hope that no matter what imports we would welcome from Britain, we should at no time attempt to import politics from there any more than we attempt to export politics from Canada to the United Kingdom.

I think it would be a healthy thing to remember that no matter how confident the members of any party may be, there is always the possibility of the judgment of the people reaching a different conclusion. That, after all, is the essence of our system and the principle that gives our system life and vitality. I believe there are obvious reasons why anyone who might be called upon to occupy the position of prime minister at any time would be well advised not to have placed himself directly or indirectly within the political arena of a country with which he might subsequently be dealing as prime minister of another government.

I say this in the hope that the reports are incorrect, and that a long established position, which I thought had been accepted by the leaders of all parties, will not be changed at this time. Obviously, if a leading figure in any party in Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan or any part of the commonwealth sees fit to come here to engage in what might be regarded as political discussion within our country, he then naturally places himself immediately in the position of expecting an answer in appropriate terms in regard to any arguments he makes.

I shall not pursue it further, except to repeat once again that I would hope a tradition which has been well recognized for good reasons is not going to be broken at this time, in spite of certain suggestions to the contrary which have appeared in the press.