

That is the real issue at stake here. Until the Government is prepared either to develop an effective regional development program, as opposed to cutting back to the tune of \$600 million or \$700 million as has been done over the past two years, while at the same time ensuring that there is an effective program for adjustment for the industries and workers affected, then we cannot make those changes. Rather than knocking out the Canadian Industrial Renewal Board, the Labour Adjustment Benefits Program or the Community Futures Program that allow industries to meet competition, rather than wiping those out and leaving people naked to deal with the change, we cannot make those changes. We cannot go about taking away the livelihood of people, destroying communities and pulling out the regional props and say that we will do absolutely nothing to provide for an adjustment or transition in between.

● (1720)

The Hon. Member's resolution is inadequate. It does not complete the statement. The statement is that in order for the Government of Canada to fully support the reduction of interprovincial trade barriers, the Government of Canada must also ensure a fair and equitable distribution of regional economic opportunity and adjustment programs to ensure that there can be transitions. Then the Provinces of British Columbia, Nova Scotia, or Ontario will be interested in negotiation. If those programs are wiped out and there is nothing in return, the type of progress that we would all like to see in reducing interprovincial trade barriers will not take place.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House is short and sweet, and perhaps one might say a little simplistic:

That, in the opinion of this House, interprovincial trade ought to be unrestrained.

When the Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) raised this question, what occurred to me first was: Is he really calling for exactly this type of unrestrained market system across Canada? If so, what will that do to many of the privileges presently built into our legislation to assist the Arctic areas? These systems create certain tax advantages which attempt to offset the geographic problems which exist. When the Member has a chance to comment further on some of the points raised I would be interested in his capacity to say "Yes, I am prepared to see my region suffer because of the unrestricted, beautiful market system which I want to see operating."

I think that hidden in this vision of a complete market system are very serious dangers which would not only damage what we have historically built in this country, but damage a great many people. For instance, our social progress has come province by province. That is part of the reason that we have a patchwork quilt system of different regulations and structures in different provinces. This capacity has allowed provinces to experiment and put into place new systems of social and

### *Interprovincial Trade*

economic relationships which, in the end, has benefited Canadians a great deal.

For example, tremendous differences in approach were taken with respect to pay equity and to affirmative action in the different provinces as they affect the women of Canada. The Province of Manitoba has taken a different position and is experimenting with different approaches than the Province of Quebec followed in the past. The Province of Ontario is now experimenting with systems which are again different than those in British Columbia. That is part of the value of the provincial structure that we have in Canada that permits us to experiment and compare different approaches in different contexts.

I am sure the Hon. Member himself, and many Members of the House recognize that there are parts of the country which are far less advantaged than the part of Ontario which I represent. The economic development of those parts of Canada also must be encouraged by specific measures which try to run in the face of the normal push of the market which would leave those parts of Canada as disadvantaged, and perhaps even more disadvantaged in the future.

There are experiments taking place in Yukon under the New Democratic Party territorial government that has been established there. For the first time, it has established a strict policy of local purchase for quite a number of its needs in Government. This has led to considerable increases in local jobs, local production, and to a new sense of economic growth and expansion in Yukon which I applaud.

From my trips across Canada two years ago with the action group of the federal New Democratic Party, I have a sense of the dreams that many Canadians have of being able to have a much greater sense of local control, a much greater handle locally on what is happening to them and to their economy, whether it is shipbuilders in Saint John, fishermen in Newfoundland, carpenters in Saskatoon, groups who have formed co-ops in British Columbia, or municipal development corporations. These groups at the grass roots have attempted to build in their locality a sense of something that they can do about the economic problems which face them. It worries me that an expression of opinion which says that the market system should rule supreme would very much undercut their dreams and their hopes for the future.

Picking up here on one of the positive points that the Member made in his introduction to his motion, I think it is important that we have more integration of our economy. For us to do that, we have to plan for it in co-operation with the private sector for the development of high technology sectors in certain parts of the country. We have to shape our transportation system so that western coal, for instance, does serve Ontario Hydro, and so that Cape Breton is producing steel for CN across Canada. That type of planning is the antithesis of the unrestrained market system which I think has been put before us in this motion today.