

Economic Development

Where is our share, Mr. Speaker? Do you hear any talk about our share of manufacturing or our share of the components industry? We never hear of this from the government and you never hear it from outside either. If you do not push for it you do not get it. We do not push, therefore, we will not get it.

This is going to be the new way of doing things, however. You can see it coming. The Ford Motor Company has made it quite clear that they hope to enter into an agreement with Toyota in the near future. The agreement will mean that Toyota vehicles will be manufactured in the United States. The component parts will also be manufactured there. AMC has indicated that they have a similar agreement and are about to do the same thing. The small car will be manufactured on the North American continent—but where will our share be, Mr. Speaker? When will we hear the government address this and many other problems of the manufacturing sector? It is a sector that has been sorely neglected and which, to a large extent, is controlled by the subsidiary operation, or the parent company in other parts of the world but primarily in the United States. When things do not go well at home they do not look to Canada and say there is a good operation there that they want to keep going. Rather, they take the operation out of Canada and put it back near the parent company because they have an obligation to the government and the community in which the head office is situated.

We all know the end result, having seen it happen over the last few months. A number of companies closed down, not because they were not efficient and not because the workers were not producing—not because there was not a market for the product, but because they wanted to do the manufacturing at home. That was what was in the best interests of the United States economy. That is the kind of manufacturing sector we have, without any degree of economy or any opportunity to enter world markets. It is influenced, if not controlled, by the extraterritorial application of corporate law. I suggest that is another area we should be examining, Mr. Speaker.

Tourism is another area to which we must give some attention. We must learn to take advantage of the tremendous natural tourist attractions that we have in this country. The other day I drove from Ottawa to Hamilton. As I drove through the St. Lawrence area, past Brockville and on to Hamilton, I could not but remark how wonderful and marvelous it was. It is breathtaking, Mr. Speaker, yet we do not have a co-ordinated tourist promotion program. The government does not appear to be interested in it, yet it provides a grand opportunity for capital flow into Canada and a chance to reverse some of the trends.

The discussion goes on about energy, of course. Some of our colleagues, representing Alberta and other places, speak about the need to go to world prices. We have to ask ourselves why we should go to world prices. Just because someone in Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq or Egypt decides to hold us to ransom, does that mean we have to pay the same ransom to our own family? Surely to heaven it can be seen clearly that we ought to be doing the same thing these other countries are doing in an

effort to develop their industry and their economy. We should be using the money to make the transition that must be made from a heavy reliance on oil to other energy resources, but we are not doing that. We should be talking about a pipeline from west to east rather than from north to south.

We should be talking about an integrated energy policy that takes into account not only petroleum based products but also electricity and all the other methods of developing energy. We need an infrastructure that allows for the transition that must take place from our heavy reliance on petroleum based energy to a more readily renewable resource. We are not doing that and, indeed, we are not even talking about it. We are still caught up in the debate about whether we should be paying \$36 per barrel, what we should be doing with the money, how much should be going to the companies, how much should be going to Alberta and how much should be coming to the federal treasury, without any discussion about what is in the best interests of Canada as a whole.

Then there is the question of finance and all the problems we have seen in the recent discussion of the Bank Act and the way interest rates have been manipulated. People have lost their homes because of that manipulation, and people have lost their businesses because they could not afford to pay for the inventory they had to carry.

The high cost of money has made it virtually impossible for expansion to take place in the industrial marketplace, because people cannot afford to pay the high cost. There is no clear direction from the government, however, on what its fiscal or financial policy is. We end up with a void caused by inaction. Inaction in itself breeds lethargy and lethargy means higher costs, because those who are not so scrupulous take advantage of the circumstances.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are some things we might do, and I shall be brief. There are nine areas of concern. We might divide the House of Commons into nine committees and give each of those nine committees responsibility—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Roger Simmons (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, as soon as the boys in the NDP settle their little row, we will get on with the evening's events.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, could we go back to Ian?

Mr. Simmons: I realize that what the NDP member was saying may be more pleasing to Tory ears than what they will hear me say in a few minutes. Even the NDP agrees with that, Mr. Speaker.

I have been forced to go back to the motion to find out what we are debating. I have listened with some interest this after-