

The Address—Mr. Fraser

discussing shortly is the question of opposition days and the allotment thereof?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I join with the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton in his words with regard to both the former House leader and the one before him who has come back to us. I welcome the President of the Privy Council back to the House leader level. I do not know whether that is a plateau, a peak or a valley, but in any event we welcome him back. I should like to say that if he can persuade this government to come through with legislation along the lines he was able to get the government to agree to when he was last House leader, this will be a very good parliament. I am sure the hon. member knows what I mean. If he can just do some of the things he was not able to do in May, 1974, that would be good for everybody.

Having regard to the business of the House in the weeks that lie ahead, since it has been the practice for a number of years to have a list of the bills the government proposes to introduce during the session presented to the House and placed on the record of *Hansard*, I am wondering if that will be done in this session and, if so, will it be done very soon?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker. I have considered that possibility and see no advantage in producing a formal list at this particular stage. I will give the hon. member and other hon. members as much detail as possible about the evolving legislative program.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed from Wednesday, October 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Maurice Harquail for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto by (Mr. Clark) (p. 28) and the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Broadbent) (p. 37).

Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, before commencing my remarks I want, through you, to congratulate the various hon. members on the government side on the recent positions to which they have been appointed, and wish them well in their endeavours.

● (1210)

I think I might also say they will be watched very closely because it is quite apparent to the Canadian public, and I think certainly to all hon. members who listened to what their constituents had to say during the summer, that there is much uneasiness with the present government and the present approach the government is taking. That uneasiness in my opinion is not just a passing phase but is deeply rooted and stems from a good number of years of not just mismanagement

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

but no management at all. That lack of management and leadership is the underlying problem the country faces. I say with as much kindness as I can to the new ministers that this is the fundamental task to which they will have to address themselves and that unless they do so the country will not withstand another two years of what we have been through.

I must say I regret that the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) is not here because a personal matter has required that he leave the House. However, I think it would be improper to rise in this debate without stating something bluntly to my friends and colleagues in the New Democratic Party. It is all very well for them to try to take the position on television or in other places that the Conservative Party has no policies or positions. The fact of the matter is that consistently in this House over a good number of years we have said that the country's recovery will depend on productivity, on a competitive market system and a high degree of management-labour accord as well as a close rapport and relationship between government, management and labour. We have said this repeatedly and we have said it in a responsible way. We have said it because it needed to be said since it was not being said by the members of the government or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and certainly was not being said by some of my hon. friends in the New Democratic Party.

It is time that the New Democratic Party and the government began to realize that the public is not impressed with an economy that is stagnant as the result of the mismanagement by the government of the day and partly because of the philosophy and at times utter nonsense uttered by the other opposition party, the New Democratic Party. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party at times, even when it is headed—I was going to use the expression “in the right direction” but they would not like that—in the appropriate direction, handles itself with such complete irresponsibility that it cannot be taken seriously. I am sorry to have to say this as bluntly as I do, but it is true. It was exhibited in the amendment moved yesterday by the New Democratic Party. I wish to read that amendment:

We also affirm that the failure of the government to end the wage and price control program immediately, in light of . . .

Then, it continues. There is no question but that there are aspects of this wage and price control program with which not only do we, along with our friends from the New Democratic Party, quarrel but which we pointed out would cause trouble at the time the legislation was debated. But it would be completely irresponsible to end the program immediately; that cannot be done and the New Democratic Party ought to know that. So, we have to say we agree with the New Democratic Party that there are inequities in the control program and that it could be and should be improved.

We might take as an example the situation we have in the Yukon Territory at the moment where the Cyprus-Anvil Mining Company achieved an agreement many months ago. The Anti-Inflation Board rolled back the agreed wage scale once, and then changed it. Then, the administrator came in and rolled it back a third time to a lower figure. One result of