

*Speech from the Throne*

Our first objective would be the creation of sufficient opportunities for meaningful employment for Canadians—

Motherhood! Sheer, unadulterated motherhood! There is not a word about how this would be achieved, not a single word from this party which would provide sufficient opportunities for meaningful employment for Canadians.

**Mr. Bigg:** Tell us something about transportation, and not political garbage.

**Mr. Jamieson:** It looks like we're scoring, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Mr. Jamieson:** What I started to say, Mr. Speaker, was that having made this very profound statement with which nobody can disagree, the Leader of the Opposition gives no indication of how his party would wrestle with the universal problem, experienced in industrial countries at least, of how one achieves full employment while at the same time controlling runaway prices and wages and all the other problems that have inflation as their root. Nor does he indicate whether his party is in favour of price and wage controls. Is it in fact the policy of the Tory party to introduce price and wage controls? Does the Leader of the Opposition support them, or is that the private preserve of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), that perennial Peter Pan of the Tory party?

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

**Mr. Jamieson:** One can imagine what the reaction would be if this statement of the Leader of the Opposition were in the Throne Speech, standing all by itself, unprotected:

Our third priority is the pursuit of steady economic growth in terms both of gross national product and in terms of productivity through a program of incentives to encourage the initiative of Canadians in all branches of business, industry, farming and other occupations.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what is known in legal terms as the basket clause. You throw the whole works in together. You get in the motherhood words, like "incentives" and "initiatives" and you latch them on to every conceivable pressure group in the country. How this is going to be achieved, we do not know. It says nothing. And what about this marvellously ingenious phrase:

Fourth, we recognize the need as a basic priority to communicate a sense of national purpose to the Canadian people.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the first politician who ever took to the hustings in Canada invented such a phrase. In fact, there is nothing new or ingenious about it. Even Dalton Camp and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) could agree on that one.

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

**Mr. Jamieson:** But, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what kind of initiative, what kind of incentive and what kind of national purpose? Are these initiatives that are going to be provided, and have been included in this basket clause, to cover all manner of people—incentives of the sort that would give a guaranteed annual income, something which is an anathema to a large section of the party opposite? Or is there to be an incentive for the free-wheeling free

[Mr. Jamieson.]

enterpriser section of the Tory party? You have to choose between these two kinds of incentives.

Is the incentive going to be freer trade, which undoubtedly many of the farmers might very well want; or is there to be more protection for the businessman whom the Leader of the Opposition puts cheek by jowl with all the other occupations in that phrase? I say once again that if the Leader of the Opposition expects the people of Canada to swallow these kinds of generalities, he is very much mistaken. Next in this imaginary Tory Throne Speech we come to these words:

We should adopt immediately the concept of a full employment budget in this country.

That is it, full stop, paragraph, nothing else.

We should adopt immediately the concept of a full employment budget in this country.

How are we going to adopt it? What kind of full employment budget? The Leader of the Opposition points out that in fact this has been done in the United States. Mr. Speaker, it was done about a year or so ago in the United States; but is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting that the results that flowed from it there are the kinds of things we want in Canada? Is that the model we want to follow? Has he forgotten that just a few months after the so-called full employment budget was introduced in the United States their levels of unemployment were still virtually what they were before, and that in addition the United States had to undertake the most drastic kind of fiscal and monetary measures, perhaps the most drastic known in the history of that country? He simply says, calmly and coolly:

• (2050)

We should adopt immediately by the concept of a full employment budget in this country.

Then we come to this one, and it is a real puzzler. If this were in a Tory Throne Speech, I do not know how I would respond to it. The Leader of the Opposition said:

There should have been some proposal to draw Canadians together in the fight against inflation and, in particular, some clarification of the role of the Prices and Incomes Commission.

What does that mean? Does it mean that this party which has villified the Prices and Incomes Commission from the beginning will retain the commission? If it intends to retain it, presumably it will make substantial changes.

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

**Mr. Jamieson:** Please do not bother me while I am at work. I don't go down in the sewer and take your time. The hon. gentleman will have his time, if he has not had it already.

**Mr. Bigg:** Tell us about freight rates.

**Mr. Jamieson:** We are hitting you, boy, right where it hurts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. I think hon. members should let the minister complete his remarks. An hon. member who wants the floor can seek it by the normal procedure. The Minister of Transport.