

this country, are cutting and slashing the country into several parts? Is there no Liberal member with the courage to speak up for the economic reunification of Canada, instead of the constitutional severing of its parts?

Perhaps that is unfair. Even the Liberal member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) on December 18 last in this House called on his own minister to accelerate government investment in research to the 1.5 per cent it claims it will get to by 1985, and to do it right away. Is there no other Liberal conscience which rebels at the thought that it voted and lied about an 18-cent gasoline tax but now condones a 10-cent or 12-cent tax, which will go on forever, to pay for the purchase of what must be the dingiest collection of gas stations in the country? This will now allow the bureaucracy of the Government of Canada to get out of the offices and into the streets to compete with and put out of business the small retail gasoline station owners. Will nobody on the other side of the House rise in his place and deplore the spending of a billion and a half Canadian dollars, almost double the value of the company whose shares it bought? All that money is being sent to Belgium, when it could be used to create more Canadian jobs and find more Canadian oil.

● (1510)

It is clear that no one on that side will speak for all Canada, and that is a shame. With a government which is all speech and no action, with a Minister of Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment who speaks about increased research funding and job-creating while cutting back on the government's share, with a Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gray) who speaks of industrial growth and job creation while unemployment in industry continues to climb, even in his own constituency, one would think that a government which only speaks would at least speak for all Canadians. Is it any wonder my colleague moved to condemn this well-speaking, smokescreening and underachieving Liberal government, and I unreservedly supported the motion on behalf of all Canadians whose faith in their government has been breached? The word I looked up in the dictionary to explain the phrase I used earlier was "treason".

Miss Aideen Nicholson (Trinity): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate on an industrial development policy. Of course, these words mean different things to different people. It seems to mean to some from whom we have heard today—let the private sector do as it wishes. But, this kind of laissez-faire economy ceased to be viable a very long time ago. To some rather trendy economists talking about industrial strategies, it seems to mean some kind of economic engineering. We have heard talk of picking the winning industries and dropping the losers, which often sounds as harsh as it sounds impractical, because a losing industry means unemployed people and, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) once said, unemployed people are not a series of statistics but a series of individual tragedies.

In much of the talk we hear about developing high-technology industries, there is a remarkable lack of sensitivity to the

many people who would be left unemployed and to the fact that many of these people are women with children and households who cannot—if a textile industry in Quebec or Ontario should close down, for example—easily move to Alberta or become employed in a high-technology industry.

When I talk about an industrial strategy, I think of a set of policies, of an orderly and integrated way of co-ordinating government policies and, above all, of a human approach with care for the ideals of social justice, for individual dignity, for safety in the workplace and for industrial democracy. Occupational health and safety must be a particular concern at the present time, because we are still losing far more days of work and industrial productivity as a result of illness or injury on the job than as a result of strikes. Unless there is a progressive sharing of the material wealth of society, unless there is active participation in decision-making by the workers who produce that wealth, we will not succeed and, perhaps, we would not deserve to succeed.

I should like to refer to one of the more promising initiatives which arose out of the study the government initiated a few years ago on various industrial sectors when government, industry and labour worked together in partnership. As one might have expected, the report indicated that umbrella organizations in industry and labour were less successful in relating to each other. For example, a meeting of the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the Canadian Labour Congress was not always terribly productive. But given a situation in which people with similar interests, such as workers and management from a particular sector of industry, got together to discuss the problems of that industry, ways of making it more productive and more prosperous, the members reported that they found more about which to agree than to disagree. Obviously this was because people in the same industry have similar knowledge and interests. A union leader can read a balance sheet as well as anyone else; he knows the product and he knows its possibilities.

The more formalized European type of three-way participation—industry, labour and government—may not necessarily be for us at this time. But it is quite clear that there is very active participation in a less formal way and that this can certainly be enhanced. The moneys which the federal government made available to the labour field some time ago for continued education are certainly being well used. This is increasingly resulting in well-informed and sophisticated labour leaders who have much to contribute to our future industrial development.

These people-oriented initiatives may not sound as glamorous as economists' talk of industrial restructuring and technological innovation, but nevertheless they can help turn the economy around.

I would like to refer to some other elements which I consider to be very important in a set of co-ordinated industrial strategies. The first element is energy, which has already been addressed by a number of speakers today. It is obvious that Canada has not only possibilities but reasonable assurances of security of supply for a long time ahead, which will attract