

I could not believe it. I checked the English version and found the same idea, unfortunately:

—in all branches of business, industry, farming and other occupations.

This is not a choice, saying: We are going to encourage industrial development, or development “in all branches of business, industry, farming and other occupations”.

• (1550)

It is often said that to govern is to choose. Similarly, to establish an industrial policy is to choose. It is quite possible that through one's choice—and this is normal—one might promote the development of one particular sector of trade or industry over another, and one can very easily be led to say, that sector is not efficient, it has no future, not only will we not encourage it to develop but even encourage it not to develop.

This is the kind of thing a valid industrial policy should hold. Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising to see that in the circumstances there are but few people who are prepared to make those choices, and then it is normal for the opposition to say to the government, make those choices and we will be able to criticize them once you have made them.

In the months to come I intend to expose myself, to be audacious and I will start by making a few speeches on that subject, so as to set the debate on the right track.

The first will be on the complexity of the task, on the complexity of developing an industrial policy, an industrial strategy, that is the difficulties of setting up specific goals which can meet the consensus of a majority of the population. It is not an easy thing to do. One can come up with all kinds of philosophical thoughts in favour of maternity without of course making enemies but when it comes down to setting up more specific goals, of course, this becomes more complicated.

I will be discussing in that speech the need to recognize all the factors involved, whether they be historical, geographical, constitutional, cultural, etc., and the difficulty to co-ordinate tax, monetary, trade, tariff, scientific, educational policies, etc., as well as the lack of a central unit of political and economic power in Canada. People say, let the federal government develop an industrial strategy, just as if the federal government had supreme authority over the provinces and private industry, as if we were in Prussia, in the 19th century, and we asked a general of the Prussian army to indicate his strategy. He would do it because they had only one decision centre. But it is not the same in Canada, in 1972. In other words—

**Mr. Barnett:** Demagogue or demagogues!

**Mr. Pepin:** —if my hon. friend of the NDP thinks that we will have a “gosplan”, Russian style, he is making a mistake.

It is not what the people expect from their government.

**Mr. Barnett:** Fewer speeches and more action.

**Mr. Pepin:** In my second speech, I would like to define the experiments that have already taken place in this area of industrial strategy.

**An hon. Member:** May I ask a question?

### *Speech from the Throne*

**Mr. Pepin:** I am sorry, I will answer any number of questions when I am through.

I would like to talk about the experiments that have been tried already in some sectors of Canadian industry. It is common knowledge that my department and others as well have experimented with various industrial strategies in different fields such as electronics, textiles and ship-building. These experiments covered streamlining and specialization.

A study will have to be made of the experiments in order to recognize what problems are likely to occur and what solutions can be worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that many of those who speak of industrial strategy are not aware that such strategy does exist. Imperfect or inadequate it may well be, and this I recognize, but it still cannot be said that there is no strategy now which, to my view, would be suggesting that the history of Canada begins with us, with the speaker's appearance on the stage.

I am conservative enough to hold the same view as Burke did when he said he was suspicious of any allegedly new policy. If a policy is new, he said, that means it has no roots, no foundation in reality. It can be seen I have read my conservative authors well.

A new policy emerged the day before from Jupiter's thigh would seem suspicious to me precisely because it has not been subjected to the test of time and experience.

Finally, in the third speech I hope to make within a few months, I should like to outline, so that others may criticise, what an industrial strategy could be, spelling out objectives, criteria, priorities, identification mechanisms, etc.

That is the first step I should like to carry out. The second, consultation, has already been initiated. It is my intention to consult all those concerned in the world of business, labour, and particularly all those who have expressed or will express in the coming months their views on this industrial strategy.

All those who have made speeches or who intend to do so will be summoned and asked to reconcile their arguments with those of others, all of them intelligent and yet who think in a completely different way from them. That is not a threat on my part. On the contrary, I think that people who made representations, who have carried out analyses on the industrial policy, are courageous and deserve to be applauded. We will put their contribution to test, as it were.

So much for industrial strategy.

A few words now on our relations, on current negotiations with the United States. The time is not ripe to deal extensively with this matter. I only hope that it will come soon, after agreement has been reached with the United States on the elimination of certain irritants.

I only have two comments, Mr. Speaker. The first relates to the manner in which current negotiations are carried out; the second concerns its content. As to the way the negotiations are carried out, I can only mention that there are in our midst doves and hawks,