

*Speech from the Throne*

**Mr. Bigg:** What do you know about freight rates? Do you want some more?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Speaker, what I was about to say with regard to freight rates and the whole question of transportation was that in point of fact I am exercising the democratic right which many members opposite have explained as being part of this debate, that is, that a member is free to talk about any subject of his choosing. This is what I have chosen, and I feel it is apt.

**Mr. Bigg:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Bigg:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I was asked by the hon. member who has the floor to rise and say something and explain why I want to talk about transportation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Hon. members know we must abide by the rules of the House. The minister has the floor, and unless he yields the floor no other hon. member can speak. The rules do not permit us to go from one hon. member to another and get into an exchange. Each hon. member has to make a speech in his due time, and only when recognized by the Chair. The Minister of Transport.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Baldwin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) on a point of order.

**Mr. Baldwin:** You are quite right, of course, about the rules, Mr. Speaker; but I would point out that in this case the minister, not doing very well having the floor, gave it to the hon. member.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** On the point of order just raised, the hon. member knows, I am sure, that it is for the Chair to recognize hon. members and not for a minister or a private member.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for his short, instructive lecture on parliamentary procedure.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Any time.

• (2100)

**Mr. Jamieson:** As the hon. member knows, I am always anxious to hear what hon. members opposite have to say. I wish to say once again, if I may answer my hon. friend, that the debate on CNR financing is coming up in a few days and it was my intention to devote a speech at that time to the questions which he raised. I hope that will dispose of the matter.

What I was going to say on the question, if I may put it in simple terms, of making sure that our industries in Canada are put in the position of being able to compete is that the subject is tremendously complicated and involves

[Mr. Jamieson.]

transportation. I merely want to say that, ironically, I have received even in the last few days protests from Manitoba to the effect that the freight assistance we are providing in eastern Canada constitutes unfair competition. Therefore, one has to go to western Canada to hear something good said about transportation in eastern Canada, and vice versa.

I say in all seriousness that it is not enough simply to add that our industries in Canada must be put in the position of being able to compete. We must round that out, when we talk about competition. How are they to compete, and with whom? Are we talking about international trade? Are we talking about the tremendous competition which goes on among the various regions of Canada?

As the statement stands in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, it is meaningless, totally and absolutely. And so, Mr. Speaker, in concluding my commentary on this sort of imaginary Tory Throne Speech one must say to use a stock phrase, that it is more significant for what it does not contain than for what it says. Even in terms of a speech by the Leader of the Opposition, about the best that can be said for it is that it is essentially rambling rhetoric and oversimplification. Indeed, it would be well if most of us in this House, regardless of where we sit, heeded something once said. I do not remember which particular philosopher said that the essence of tyranny is the denial of complexity, but if ever there was a denial of complexity one can see it in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. I could put everything of a policy nature which was contained in his remarks on one page.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** And the Speech from the Throne could be put in one sentence.

**Mr. Jamieson:** I am sorry to say that his statements were not in the least significant. My time is running out, Mr. Speaker, and I may not be able to do justice to the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Lewis) and the other heavyweights who took part in this debate.

**Some hon. Members:** Continue.

**Mr. Jamieson:** I confess that I was singularly disappointed by the contribution of the leader of the NDP. He knows—and I wish he were here tonight—that I have great respect for him and for his debating ability. Yet when one looks at his contribution in this debate, once again it is easy to see that he has totally avoided saying anything about his party's policies and, on that occasion at least, he resorted to the cheapest kind of political haymaking.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Jamieson:** He began by describing the Throne Speech as a speech made up of purple prose. I wish he were here, because I would tell him that if he were to read his remarks with intellectual honesty he would discover that the further he went into his speech the more purple he became, and by the time he had finished anything in the Throne Speech, in terms of rhetoric and purple prose, had been left far behind in his remarks. I confess that my difficulty with the NDP is not one of philosophy or ideology. There are many matters on which that party and I