

Interim Supply

Mr. Macdonnell: Would the hon. member permit me to say that I think he has completely destroyed his own argument by those observations. My understanding of GATT is that it is open for members to negotiate with each other and to come to an agreement within the four corners of GATT whereby certain tariffs may be altered. There is give and take. Certain tariffs are raised and certain tariffs are lowered. I think what the hon. gentleman has just said is a confirmation of what I believe, namely, that we have operated within the four corners of the agreement. I think the hon. member should take back what he said about our disregard for GATT because I think it was absolutely wrong.

Mr. Regier: I am absolutely unwilling to take back my basic allegation because I am sure that if the party to which the hon. member for Greenwood belongs goes to the country it will attempt to prove to the Canadian voter that it has protected Canadian industry by increasing tariffs here, there, and everywhere.

Mr. Macdonnell: Within the four corners of GATT.

Mr. Regier: I will not agree with the hon. member for Greenwood that this has been done within the four corners of GATT. I believe the Canadian record in this regard is almost as bad as the record of the United States, and the record of the United States government in observing the spirit of GATT is very bad indeed as we Canadians have good cause to know because we have had to suffer the effects of many of the major violations on the part of the U.S.A. Our government seems to pursue a merry course, independent and in isolation. Let the rest of the world form economic trading blocs; let the rest of the world get together in groups and abolish tariff barriers—we Canadians are going to steer our own course; we are even going to increase the walls which surround us, by the back door method if by no other method. We predict that this will be disastrous to the health of the Canadian economy. I am unwilling to advocate at this moment that we should affiliate ourselves with one economic bloc or another, but I do say we have to consider what is happening in the world and that it is disastrous for Canada to isolate herself and to become, in effect, even more exclusively dependent for our economic welfare on the level of economic activity prevailing the other side of the 49th parallel.

This government was elected on a declaration that we ought to take a few of our eggs out of that one basket and place them in a few other baskets. But ever since 1957 this government has done absolutely nothing

[Mr. Regier.]

to make this country any less dependent on the United States economy. The government and its supporters cannot point to a single instance where, by legislation or otherwise, they have attempted to distribute our eggs into more than the one basket.

We say that this government is undeserving of interim supply because it lacks a national transportation policy. Oh yes, it has set up royal commissions on this subject and investigations on that. But I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how can we deal with the problem of the railroads of Canada without also considering trucking, shipping, air lines and all other modes of transportation? We have no national transportation policy. True, we have resolved our railroad problem for the time being. We have swept it under the rug until the end of this year. I can well understand why the Prime Minister may want an election this fall: It is because round about the end of this year he will again be faced with the ugly problem which is presented to us by the national railroads. All we have done so far is to sweep this under the rug and it may well be an election will be held before we have to face this difficulty. What we need is a real royal commission to consider transportation in all its aspects rather than a royal commission investigating only one phase of national transportation. We in this group say that national transportation involves a public utility and that sooner or later we shall have to reach the conclusion that public utilities ought to be publicly owned.

We have no national policy on energy. We have conflicting interests. We have an ineffective national energy board whose terms of reference and whose powers are so limited that it is unable to deal adequately with the work assigned to it, because it is forbidden to explore other fields of energy.

As I mentioned yesterday, this government is unworthy of interim supply because it is turning back the clock of Canadian national development. I am not going to pursue that subject now, except to say a word or two on the utter failure of this administration to develop a national capital of which we can all be proud. Ottawa is a city which is magnificent in many respects, but everything of magnificence in this city is here as a result of the national capital commission. We have slums side by side with splendour and I believe the time is long overdue, especially since we are going to celebrate a hundredth birthday two years hence, for much more aggressive action to be taken on the part of the government.

We have a government which does not recognize the need of national growth in the economic field so as to provide for full employment. We say that full employment can