The Address-Hon. M. Lambert

ment. I would have liked to have gone into the subject raised by the hon, member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) concerning Canada's relations with Taiwan and some of the things we were able to see during the recess. I would have liked to have gone into the relationship between the government and Canadian participation in the deliberations of the Council of Europe, which I heartily support because this gives members of parliament an opportunity to speak to their opposites in the parliaments of Europe. This is the only place where there could be a dialogue between members of this parliament and members of the Assembly of the Council of Europe which in its membership as observers goes much beyond the United States, which has had observer status there for a long time. We are invited to assume that position of observer. The hand of invitation is out. I think it is up to Canada to respond affirmatively. There is no question that Canadian contacts around the world on a ministerial or government basis are far too narrow. I think a greater role can be played by members of parliament from all parties. This is the kind of forum if you like, the kind of arena, in which members of parliament from this House and senators from the other place could exchange views without being tied by government positions. This is terribly important.

I could talk about industrial strategy and about national unity. At the moment there is a great deal of malaise in the national body. Many people say it is a sense of regional alienation, but it is only because they have become aware of an already existing inequality. The favourite whipping dog in this field of alienation over the past decade was the province of Quebec.

[Translation]

In the province of Quebec, it was a cultural, a linguistic situation, but never an economic issue. There was never any argument on this point. Moreover, the claims of Quebec barely touched the economic situation.

Mr. Bell: That is true.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Now, we get to western Canada. There, the sense of injustice and alienation is purely economic. I suppose some of it may be a little geographical, but primarily it is economic. But that has been a grievance for a long time. As a young man I was aware of many of the arguments which basically exist today although in more modern dress, such as freight rates, the cost of manufactured goods from central Canada and so on. Now, there is the fact that there is a price freeze-yes, a price freeze-on an essential commodity, 85 per cent of which is produced in the province of Alberta. This has been imposed without consultation by central Canada on the basis apparently that there should not be windfall profits to those who are exploiting the resources. I intend to ask the Minister of Finance why he and his administration do not move in on the gold mines of Ontario and Quebec which have the major monopoly on the production of gold in this country. At today's prices if there aren't windfall profits in gold then the whole situation is crazy. There are no windfall profits with regard to

In this situation, oil was seized upon as a convenient whipping boy, and there must be a great deal of careful negotiation. There is no way that, shall we say, the benefits of a below-world price on this commodity in Canada is to be loaded on the backs of Canadians who happen to live in Alberta. If that were done, then I think the people of western Canada could say, do it with regard to lumber because those people pay world prices for lumber, or do it with regard to nickel because they must pay the world price for nickel. Also could we not do it for steel, because they pay the world competitive price for steel. The arguments used by the government in this connection are as empty as a hollow egg shell.

I suggest that in order to justify just what shall be a Canadian position, a negotiated Canadian position, there are other arguments which must be used. I will admit that in many areas there has been a sense of isolation and injustice, but this has existed for a long time. It is the oldest cliché in Canada to say Canada is a hard country to govern. Let us get on with it and try to change the pattern. I think we require a national mobilization of effort to master inflation at the present time. To counter inflation we get bandaids and blow-out patches applied from time to time by the government of Canada whether or not they suit the purpose of any provincial government. Whether or not it suits the purposes of such governments in any region of Canada, the government of Canada moves in without consultation and unilaterally takes those steps it has decided upon.

Although the impact of any policy may not be too bad in, say, Ontario, it could be disastrous in the Atlantic provinces. It may not affect Alberta very much and yet the neighbour in Saskatchewan may be hard hit. That is not the way to proceed. In this whole area of combatting inflation an industrial strategy must be developed. The situation today is an indication of the bankrupt performance by the government of Canada and the provinces. I will not entirely absolve the provinces because there is a bankruptcy of leadership in this country with regard to industrial strategy as a whole. It is a dog-eat-dog operation. The leader of the dogs is the program on regional and economic expansion. Action is taken without consideration of the aspirations of the provinces. It is usually done with an eye to the political climate and the political return. We know it is on the basis of beggar thy neighbour in many instances. A plant is established in one province so that one of a similar nature may be closed in an adjoining province. It is strictly on that basis. However, I shall have more to say about this on a later occasion. We receive complaints from the provinces that it is either economic clout that is used to back up the government's action or just plain bullying, such as the attempts at bullying we have had in respect of the marketing of oil.

• (1420)

During the last month we have seen that "brain trust" in the cabinet, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) come out with a program that was filched directly from the Hudson Institute—the statistics were quoted directly from the compilations of that organization—for the development of the tar sands. The government of Canada would borrow capital from various countries and the tar sands would be developed on a crash basis over the next ten years. Thousands of Korean labourers would be imported.