

public inquiry to give Canadians across the country a sense of commitment from Bell Helicopter in the context of this project. The Minister has not been prepared even to answer the latter, let alone to launch a public inquiry, which is crucial to give the people of the country the sense that their money is being well spent.

I would like to talk about the high-tech sector and the fact that the Government clearly does not have a strategy for that most important part of our economy which will give us the jobs that we need in the future. Instead, to my utter amazement, members of the Government stood up in the House yesterday and applauded the takeover of a prominent, viable, dynamic Canadian firm by a British state-controlled corporation which has existed for years as a regulated monopoly. I could not believe the sense of irony and delicious contradiction that the Minister must have recognized he was engaged in as he stood on the floor of the House. He was an opponent of Canadian public enterprise seeking to reduce the public sector in this country. He applauded the fact that a state-controlled corporation from Britain will have control in the future of Mitel Corporation, one of the most important high technology Canadian firms. It is incomprehensible to me, Mr. Speaker, that the back-benchers who are present today would permit the Minister to carry forward such a lack of strategy and planning as representative of the Conservative Party of Canada.

I will conclude by saying that the world according to this Minister is a world in which foreign investment and privatization will somehow save us. It is a world in which Government abdicates responsibility. It abdicates responsibility to provinces, to private oil companies, to foreign investors, and to trade with the United States. There is a challenge for the country to reduce the tragic double digit unemployment which we face in this country.

In our report, *Canada Unlimited*, we have suggested a direction in which that challenge can be met. We want to give our communities the power to shape the future for themselves. We want to put responsibility where it belongs, on the Government front benches in the House of Commons. We want to offer leadership instead of obscurity, direction instead of an *ad hoc* sense of flailing away with octopus arms in every direction.

The challenge is there, Mr. Speaker, but it is not being met. Eight months after the election of the Government it should be met. The Minister can no longer rely on interviews with *The Financial Post* to attempt to mislead us into believing that he has a strategy for the industrial development of the country. Instead of the octopus of the 1980s we look for direction and leadership. We challenge the Government to provide that for us in the future.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in some of the comments made by my colleague. He spoke of the need for a new direction. Next week there will be a Budget presented. Would my colleague expand on some of his ideas and indicate the direction in which he feels it is necessary to move and what Budget initiatives would help us to move in that direction?

Supply

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, in *Canada Unlimited* we have set out what we suggest is a counter-Budget. This approach does two things. In macro-economic terms it shows very clearly that without a significant increase in the deficit it is possible to have a much more expansionary fiscal policy which would give us a tremendous increase in jobs and a significant decrease in the unemployment rate. It suggests that rather than giving tax breaks and grants to large corporations and companies, we should put that direction on its head and give the tax breaks to middle and lower income people who will spend that money and stimulate consumer demand within the country. We also suggest that the grants, which should no longer be directed to large scale corporations, be redirected to the communities of the country, to young people, and to women's groups. They should be redirected to groups that have shown dynamism and sense of exciting new ideas that would put millions of creative possibilities into force at the local level.

● (1230)

We have suggested that this kind of decentralized community-based support, which was the policy thrust of our successful colleagues in the Yukon Territory during their campaign that just concluded, is a thrust that meets the goals of Canadians today. They do not want to see Governments controlling and running their lives. They do not want big businesses on Bay Street and St. James Street to take all the decisions that shape their future. They want community self-direction.

The Budget proposals that we have set out in a responsible, straightforward and clear way offer that direction.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions or comments? Debate.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in today's debate on an Opposition motion that is specifically concerned with the need to fight regional disparity and the fact that we think the present Government is totally insensitive to this phenomenon, which, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has been a matter of concern for politicians since Confederation. Hon. Members must realize that regional disparities, whether they concern the economy, employment or the search for equal opportunities, are as old as this country.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians have become very aware of regional disparities, especially since the beginning of the Second World War. At that time, regional disparities became very obvious. Ontario had become the industrial heartland of Canada, while other regions depended strictly on their natural resources, and we can say that since that time, the federal and provincial governments have been concerned about regional economic development.

Mr. Speaker, we know that at that time, the Atlantic provinces and Quebec, especially, were lagging behind on employment, income and all other economic indicators. Unfor-