

which might be described as being for the common good are not being made.

For example, Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things about the television phenomenon—I do not know whether any hon. members have thought about this when viewing different programs—is that television has generated a new kind of social consciousness. That has become perfectly obvious. This it has done rather quickly. A program that is pointing up the neglect of our Indians will probably be accompanied by advertisements, in full colour, for red convertible loans. The program that tells us about the threats and dangers of pollution also has within it advertised invitations to get away from it all, to fly the skies with United to sunny Hawaii and forget the whole stinking business.

An hon. Member: Why not Air Canada?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, let us say Air Canada. The point made by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is a quite legitimate one and also raises another of those tension points in the whole question of what is the proper and adequate role of various government agencies in these matters. I hope he will not divert me from my central theme because I should like to talk to him about that.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The fact is that in this kind of a complex, whatever the benefits of a market-oriented society—and I shall not go into that question today—there is no doubt that people have been far more successful in selling goods than they have been in selling ideas. One of the challenges we face is how to make a value judgment in respect of programs to correct situations and what is actually needed. It is our intention to declare our feelings to the public on these matters of concern. I came across a quotation from the German writer Dahrendorf who said this about the public attitude today:

Ours is a world of highly individual values which puts the experienced happiness of the individual in first place and increasingly lets the so-called whole slip from sight.

In other words, this is a re-affirmation of the new suggestion being made to people to do their own thing. If that is so, is it really going to make very much difference in the long run if in fact we solve the inflation problem or do any of the other things which have been pre-occupying many of our members and about which the opposition has been criticizing the government for its lack of action?

21362—17

The Address—Mr. Jamieson

What I am really saying, without getting too philosophical about it, is this: it is not enough to ask how we are going to solve inflation. What we really have to ask is: To what end are we solving inflation? If you do not have some answers in that connection it is surely evident that the frustrations that have been building up within the Canadian society, and which are symptomatic of much of the world today, will not be any less simply because we have reduced the price of sheet steel by \$6 per ton or knocked \$100 off the price of an automobile.

These things are important in themselves, of course, but as the history of the post-war world surely demonstrates, what has really happened is that we have increased our affluence enormously and moved ahead economically and socially at a rate unprecedented in Canadian history, but at this moment in time human frustration and uncertainty is greater than it ever was.

So I say we must look for these goals and objectives, and we have to find a way through which we can bring a greater degree of public participation into being. I want to re-emphasize that we are trying to make the information available. We are trying, through the use of white papers rather than legislation, in the first instance, to lay matters before the public on an alternative kind of basis by saying: This is the way we are proposing to move, but we want to hear from you whether it is the right way to move. We might say: This is one choice, here is another—and lay out before the public a whole range of choices. This is what I am hoping to do within the Department of Transport regarding the big issues with which we are engaged.

We within the department are not the repository of all wisdom. It is not the case that we know, better than everyone else with whom we have to deal, what is the best solution. Through these techniques we in the government are trying objectively to achieve a greater degree of involvement. We can only do this together.

I do not believe that on this point any kind of partisan base is likely to cause any friction among us. I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) on this point. We can, surely, be united in attempting to define the goals to which I have referred. We must ask ourselves, in the first instance, what kind of Canada we want and then move to a definition of a broad purpose that will give Canadians a real sense of involvement and some justification in answering the question: What does it mean to be a Canadian?