

urged the government to do, as had such organizations as the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council. I had said myself:

I do not think we can make enough progress by administering a regional development policy through a bureaucracy a thousand miles away. One way we can improve upon it is to decentralize these activities so that we can increase the contribution and make better use of the resources of those directly involved.

There was nothing but the silence of rejection from the government. We also said we could not do anything effective about fighting regional disparity until there was a sensible attack made on transportation problems. We on this side of the House are pleased, for whatever it may count, that the government has adopted our own proposal with respect to conducting a fresh examination, in co-operation with the provincial governments, of the freight rates structure in this country and its impact on regional economic interests and prospects. It would be comforting to believe that all this represents some change of mind, some change of heart, some new found wisdom on the part of the government. But I am unconvinced. The real difference, Mr. Speaker, between the government's mentality as of October 30 and their attitude as of today is not that they have gained some fresh wisdom, but that they have lost 40 seats. There is no real difference between the Prime Minister who dissolved this House last summer to go dialoguing with the Canadian people, and the Prime Minister who sits across from us today. He is the same Prime Minister, seasonally adjusted.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This is the same Prime Minister, and nearly the same government, which asks us to believe in their genuine conversion to the cause of Canada's economic independence. I do not know whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare ever got to the *Toronto Star* for his rendezvous and briefing. In any event, the message got to him and his colleagues. In their rush to placate their friends and pacify their critics, we have a new façade erected, made up from a grab bag of proposals, borrowed from any source they could find. After the exhaustive analysis which produced the Gray Report, after all the drafting and re-drafting and after the ultimate rejection of it, this incredible government has now at least confessed to see the need to do something. We said we would require that Canadian citizens, residents in Canada, constitute a majority on the boards of all companies operating in Canada under federal charter. The throne speech proclaims that there will be a requirement that a majority of directors of federally incorporated companies be Canadians. We said if any policy is to be effective in this regard it must be worked out in co-operation with the provinces. According to the throne speech, there will be consultation—although this was ridiculed previously—with the provinces with respect to developing measures dealing with new direct foreign investment.

We said that a Conservative government would insist that Canadians be given maximum opportunity to develop and apply their own entrepreneurial and managerial skills so as to ensure their increased participation in the business and industry of their own land. The throne speech indicates there will be measures introduced to increase Canadian participation in the ownership and

The Address—Mr. Stanfield

control of resource projects and respecting the transfer of technology from abroad and access to it by Canadian entrepreneurs. I could go on enumerating other proposals in the Speech from the Throne which have been culled from the Conservative manifesto by a government empty of its own initiatives, barren of its own policy and without an original idea in its head.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: With reference to the government's proposal to review, reorganize and reconsider the social security system in this country, we find still another hand-wringing confession. According to the throne speech, the social security system, as it applies to people who can work, must contain incentives to work and a greater emphasis on the need to get people who are on social aid back to work. Mr. Speaker, that discovery ranks with John Cabot's discovery of Newfoundland, Christopher Columbus' discovery of America and the Prime Minister's discovery of western Canada. Only a few weeks ago this kind of sentiment was characterized by the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Mackasey) as reactionary. Anyone who talked about incentives to work was no fitting apostle for the leisure society. After four and one half wasted years, now they tell us about incentives and now they talk about the need to get Canada back to work. Well, it is interesting to see how they run. But we have, I think, a somewhat novel circumstance. It could be said of that circumstance that we have a lame duck Liberal government, bargaining with the New Democratic Party to keep it in office so that it may attempt to implement some Progressive Conservative policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1520)

Mr. Stanfield: On the face of it, this might well appear to be true. But it is not only interesting, in reading the Speech from the Throne, to see those policies which, for example, have been borrowed from us in order for the government to avoid complete political bankruptcy but to notice what has been left out. A great newspaper in this country which is ordinarily quite friendly toward this government in its editorial columns made the comment, I believe, that there is less in the Speech from the Throne than meets the eye.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not the only one in this country who is in his winter of discontent. After all, he has nothing to lose but his job and, as he has told the whole country on television, he even has certain options there: he can either resign from the office or he can be kicked out, but the choice is his to some extent. This is really a winter of discontent for many Canadians whose options are running out. I refer, of course, to what has become a standing army of unemployed Canadians, some one half million of our fellow citizens, half of whom are young people and many of whom have not had a job for several years under this government. This government has a responsibility to them which it failed to discharge and, more important, Sir, this parliament has a responsibility to them which it can discharge.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!