

Supply

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The period provided for questions is within half a minute of expiring. The Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson) is seeking the floor to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Thomson: I want to ask just a quick supplementary question. I did not ask in my question for the precise number of jobs created. I just thought the Hon. Member might have the courtesy to say that unfortunately the National Energy Program deprived 27,000 Canadians of jobs, which is the truth.

Mr. Fisher: Where did you get that figure?

Mr. Thomson: It is published information from the Independent Petroleum Association. It was independently arrived at. Surely to goodness the Hon. Member cannot stand in the House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member but the period of questions has expired. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) on debate.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Do I not have a chance to reply to that diatribe?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway for the purpose of making a speech.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have enjoyed this debate today. I hesitate to say this because I will restrict some speakers, but I especially enjoyed the comments of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Maltais), the Liberal Member who last spoke, as well as those of Members on this side of the House, especially the Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) and the Hon. Member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) who I understand wrote a book with Bishop De Roo. I think they all made very good contributions. It was clear to me, as it was probably clear to people watching this debate, that the Government feels very uneasy with this resolution and with the statement of the Bishops.

When we look at their statement, the Bishops are really saying that Liberalism can no longer deliver for the Canadian people. I can understand how the Government would be upset about that. We must find a whole new system both of distributing wealth in the country and occupying idle hands, the great tragedy at present in Canada.

● (1630)

That is what the Bishops said. It is what the Bishops were really talking about. It is the same message that we as Members of Parliament are getting from this country. I see the kind, scholarly and professorial Minister who tells me that there are no answers and that no consistent industrial strategy is possible.

I agreed to a certain extent. It is like when George Bernard Shaw said the golden rule is that there are no golden rules. Maybe there are no final answers. However, you can give

people hope. There is the possibility of getting on the new wave and giving the country some direction. That is why the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) must go, and go soon. He is not prepared, nor is his Government, to give the country any solid direction. The country understands that and feels that way. We all get that message in our ridings.

The Government tell us to wait, the recovery is on the way, it is just around the corner. I ask the Government where that recovery is because there is no recovery in the life of this country. Maybe those playing the stock market, the bankers and the statisticians will barely notice it, but there is no recovery for the average man and woman in this country. I have just completed a tour of southern Ontario, the industrial heartland of this country. I asked the people whether the recovery was there. I kept getting the same answer: No, the recovery is not here. We have to pause and examine it.

What is the reaction of the Government to the Bishops? In one of my questions I stated that the Bishops' statement was inevitable. When you squeeze people out of work, including 25 per cent of our young people, you get some response. The Bishops' report is just the first response that this Government will get.

The first response of the Government was that the Bishops' report was tinged with Marxism. I believe that is what the Member said. You do not need to be a Marxist to have doubts about profits. Listen to this:

Manufacturers complain much of the bad effects of high wages and raising the price and thereby lessening the sale of their goods both at home and abroad. They say nothing about the bad effects of high profits. They are silent with regard to the pernicious effects of their own games. They complain only of those of other people.

A Bishop? No. As a matter of fact, it was Adam Smith, the father of capitalist economics, who said that. You can be critical of a system and not necessarily be a Marxist. If the Government had any sense, it would understand that.

The second reaction from Government Members as reflected in one of their speeches was to tell the Bishops in essence to butt out, to leave politics to us and stick to religion. I sincerely hope, trust and believe the Bishops have had a lot more success with their religion than this Government has had with reference to its political economics.

The Bishops have struck a responsive chord in this country. They have told us that the Government is out of touch. The Minister spoke about not having a consistent industrial strategy. That is for sure. The Government has zigged and zagged all over the place. It told us it had an industrial strategy. It did not say it was a shifting one but a solid one, a job spin-off from megaprojects. That was the industrial strategy. When the megaprojects failed, the industrial strategy failed and there has been nothing to replace it.

Even future Liberal leaders are not giving us any hope. I refer to John Turner and Donald Macdonald. When John Turner left this Government, he quickly aligned himself with