

*Government Orders*

It is important that all parts of Canada be treated fairly. We ask the government to review completely the approach it is taking on shipbuilding. It must recognize the importance of shipbuilding to all coasts and all parts of Canada and begin working with the industry, the unions and the communities in British Columbia, as with other communities across Canada, to build a shipbuilding industry that serves the public and private sectors, that can compete effectively internationally, as I know we can do. It should reflect a completely different vision of Canada than that we have seen in the last few years, a vision of selling out our heritage as a country and the technical skills we have built.

The time has come to work with Canadians to build a strategy that works for all Canadians so that we can again grasp the pride that this particular industry engenders in those who work in it, and the communities in which it is situated.

We ask the government to listen to the pleas that are coming from the west coast, and to help us all build a strong shipbuilding industry.

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the member for Victoria, speaking on behalf of his party, believes that industries generally should be subsidized. Should we subsidize heavily as he says the shipbuilding industry, the automobile industry, or would he think of more farming subsidies? Would he think of other industries that might be subsidized in various parts of the country?

Is it the policy of the New Democratic Party to just build up national debt and borrow more money to subsidize more and more? Does he not think that perhaps we might be better off if we did not subsidize at all? Should we not just keep our costs of government down so it does not come out of the backs of our taxpayers, our children and our children's children, so we would not have to pay the present debts and interest payments we have to pay on a national debt, caused by massive subsidization?

Is it the continuing policy of his party that we should continue to subsidize and subsidize and subsidize businesses that cannot cut the mustard.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, we have been listening for the last number of days, particularly during Question

Period, to the agricultural industry in this country making an overpowering case for support at a time when their competitors are being heavily subsidized overseas.

The ideological rigidity of the position suggested by the hon. member that subsidies in themselves are automatically bad and should not be given, leaves industry and the economy of this country completely, vulnerable to international competition from countries which do subsidize their industry either through direct government subsidies, as in the cases, I mentioned, or through completely inadequate wage and working conditions in other countries.

Surely the lesson of the free trade agreement and the disaster it has been for this country suggests the complete negligence of the government in its approach, the ideological rigidity that is leading to the disaster we are in. In the shipbuilding industry in particular a strong case can be made for effective subsidies. A subsidy should be considered on a cost benefit basis, that is to say, in certain industries where we are competing internationally by providing some form of concessionary financing, ultimately the decision is going to be that the returns to our community and to our country will far exceed the subsidy given. That is the business decision which we as a country make.

• (1630)

For us to just continue blindly in every single industry to have the same market conditions apply, to impose for example on the shipbuilding industry exactly the same marketing conditions as on the auto industry or other manufacturing industries is ridiculous.

The government surely must know it by now because it has to look at the results of its policy. The results of its policy is that industry all across Canada is dying and particularly the shipbuilding industry is in grave trouble.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the minister as he introduced the bill and to the comments just made by the NDP and also the comments made by our critic. I have looked at the bill and I have found to my amazement, to my shock—I just cannot believe it—that we have a bill before this Chamber that is about shipping and ships. There is one big exception. One has to wonder why the exception; I mean, who approved this exception?