

al trade. They are doing what was done in England when the government there found it could not manage the economy. They wanted to move into the common market, not because of the obvious advantages but because they saw it as a way of disciplining their economy. This government is talking about moving in the direction of freer trade despite the alternatives that are open to it. It is admitting it does not know how to handle the situation and that perhaps if Canadians are thrown to the wolves—kicked in the gut, sort of thing—they will find some way of surviving. In other words, the government will get the international community to do the things it is afraid to do and cannot accept responsibility for. The fact that a kick in the gut hurts, or that it may be pretty deadly, is overlooked.

The minister accuses friends on my right of talking out of both sides of their mouths—not that they are not capable of doing it, for all of us are capable of doing it sometimes, but he does not understand that by and large people have a commitment to free trade. Most people want to see trade liberalized around the world. We do not want a situation that does not benefit us. However, particularly when this government does not have a clue where it is going and what constitutes benefit, this is the real dilemma. I wish we had some sense that the government has done some planning and studying. Perhaps it has, but if so, we certainly do not know about it and there has been no indication of it.

A few years ago I participated in an experiment at the University of Waterloo through a course on designing an industrial strategy. The university decided on this because the minister of industry, trade and commerce of that time kept insisting it was not possible to have an industrial strategy, and that it was a laughable concept—just for kids. Now, of course, the government is a little more amenable to the idea. There is a way of planning an industrial strategy, and we did it; but not in the vague way the minister put before the House today.

We are not a stupid people, Mr. Speaker. A lot of people in this country could assist the government to design an industrial strategy if they cannot do it themselves. A great deal has been written on the subject. The Science Council of Canada has done excellent work. The Economic Council of Canada has done excellent work, and even Mackenzie King, following World War II, put out a good development paper on full employment. The foreign policy review for Canadians also put forth an industrial strategy.

What is important is that all industrial strategies have to start with some objectives. You do not start in a vacuum; you have to ask what we are trying to do for the country. One of the things that runs through the four studies I mentioned is full employment. This has been a constant Canadian goal and a constant Canadian failure. Despite every commitment to full employment, except for very brief periods we have not been able to achieve it because nobody followed through on the political objectives set out in the study papers.

In developing an industrial strategy, you ask questions about what industries would best survive in the kind of Canada we see, and what kind of industries would meet your objectives. If you are looking for full employment, it does not make sense to

Trade

pursue the policies this country has pursued almost from its inception of encouraging vast sums of money into resource development. There have been tragic failures when those resource developments are depleted and promises are not kept, as was the case in the province of my friend.

It would cost almost \$1 million today to create one job in those gigantic resource developments, so when you need 300,000 jobs in a year these gigantic projects are not going to be very fruitful. You have to concentrate on more labour-intensive industries.

Mr. Speaker, my guide, mentor and leader is indicating to me that I have two minutes left. I have an amendment to move. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

“and this House expresses its concern at the apparent strategy being used at the current GATT negotiations, which will sacrifice some sectors of our manufacturing industry, and the jobs associated with them, in return for increased export opportunities for unprocessed and semi-processed raw materials, thus condemning Canada to remain as an exporter of raw materials to more industrially developed nations.”.

● (1702)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, if we consider all the debates that we have about the industrial sector, it is apparent that there is a real problem in this area. Last week, we of the Social Credit Party of Canada proposed a motion in this regard. Today the official opposition has also moved a motion related to the possibility of developing our Canadian industries so as to create more jobs and to stabilize the industrial sector.

I do not want to criticize simply for the pleasure of criticizing or to condemn the present administrators more than necessary, but I would like to tell the House how the industry should be organized and what means we should take to try to put some order where disorder now prevails, and mostly much concern on the part of Canadian manufacturers. The representations that we make regularly and the practical suggestions that are sometimes made show that the federal government should consider the suggestions of the people who are familiar with this area.

I remember quite well that at the beginning of the present session, on October 18, 1977, the Speech from the Throne said that high rates of unemployment and inflation were clear signals of the inadequacy of economic strategies appropriate to simpler times. They are also signals of the urgent need for important structural adjustments in the economies of Canada and other industrialized countries. Also according to the Speech from the Throne, they are the symptoms of an illness which can be cured only by a re-adjustment of our values, and by a rediscovery of the merits of self-discipline and fair sharing. During another debate, I said that the intentions of the federal government to re-adjust the economic situation should result in legislation better adapted to present needs.