

*The Address—Mr. Blaikie*

heart of all the economic questions we deal with in this House. I do not think we deal with those questions adequately enough because we do not take the environmental dimension into account often enough.

I talked earlier about the international dimension, Mr. Speaker. What we need to be working for at every opportunity is a new, just and sustainable international economic order. We need international co-operation rather than competition. That is why my heart breaks whenever I hear government rhetoric, whether it be that of the Liberals or of the present Government, to the effect that we are not going to try to build co-operation, that we are going to yield to the competitive spirit and say, by God, other countries may go under but Canada is going to make sure that it is near the top. Of course, we will not be as near the top as we would like because we will not be able to muster the international meanness and power that the United States will be able to muster, and they will make sure they are at the top.

I think the difference between us and the Government is that the Government sees the way toward economic renewal as being one of complying with the world view and the demands of the international investment community. The Government has said that pretty clearly and honestly, and I appreciate that because we can then have an honest debate. However, we think that is the wrong way to go. In the final analysis it will not work because it will not face up to pressing international questions of co-operation and development, and because at home it means neglecting the environmental dimension of our economic problems. Instead, we should be providing leadership where we have a political culture which, I hope, is able to stand up to the demands of the multinational corporations and others who would have us put aside these environmental questions in order to allow them to do what they want.

We know that environmental sensitivity is seen as a barrier to investment. What has the Government done in keeping with the world view I have attributed to it? It sent out the right signal. It cancelled the Environmental Secretariat. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) spoke about that today. The Government sent out the right signal to the investment community with respect to the environmental dimensions of our problem: Don't worry about us; we are willing to forgo that, if need be, in order to please you. The Government sent out the right signals when it cancelled the Toxicology Research Centre in Guelph. I cannot think of anything more pound foolish and penny wise, more short-sighted, than for the Canadian Government, at a time when we are sitting on an environmental time bomb, to be cancelling a project whereby Canada was finally to have some kind of independent capacity to test and to arrive at a scientific judgment in the area of toxicology. If I had to think of one thing as an example of the kind of shortsightedness we are getting from this Government, that would be it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I ask the Hon. Member to conclude his speech briefly, please.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I had a few other things I would like to say but perhaps I can just wind up my comments by saying this. What we have here on the part of the Government is an attempt to go back to an economic ethic previous to the welfare state when the real solution to the problems of the Liberal welfare state is not to go back but to go ahead and do some new economic thinking, take into account what is really going on in our fields, forests and oceans, and arrive at new economic solutions which take all this into account and give up the phoney bookkeeping which leaves the environmental dimension on the side.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Questions and comments?

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, as always the speech by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) was excellent, but the point he was making toward the end of his speech is something I think well worth pursuing in light of the difficult negotiations between Canada and the U.S. regarding the Love Canal, the S-Dump, Hyde Park and others which are leaching particularly toxic chemicals, dioxins in particular, into the Great Lakes system. They are as well endangering the lives of millions of Canadians and Americans. I know one of the few requirements in Canada is to really get a handle on what is happening in the Great Lakes. We know about the Mirex contamination of eels that we previously exported to Germany. We know about the possibility of the movement of certain dioxins into the Toronto water supply and so on.

Can the Hon. Member outline in somewhat greater detail the difficulties from an environmental perspective where the Government takes away that kind of funding from the only institute in Canada which could really do that kind of thorough ongoing work? What will it ultimately mean, not only in terms of potential danger to Canadian public health, but also to the environment where these hazardous wastes will build up and become a far greater and more unmanageable problem down the road? Could he expand on that particular point?

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) for his question. What we have by way of government action as a result of the cut-backs announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) is, as I said, a very shortsighted strategy. The Minister for Science and Technology (Mr. Siddon) was on his feet today referring to the cut of the manufacturing and technology centre in Winnipeg. He said that he looked forward to the day when all this would somehow be taken up by the private sector. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we wanted to have these kinds of publicly funded research institutes is that for so long we have been dependent on the private sector research activity in the United States, which has proven, time and time and time and time again, to be inadequate, false in many cases and all the time suspect, to the degree that private sector research is funded by the very people who would benefit from research and who declare their products to be safe and marketable.