

*Natural Resources*

come from the northern parts of Canada have somewhat dominated the debate today, but there is ample reason for this. As the hon. member for Timiskaming pointed out in his opening statement, the meaning of the word "exploitation" has changed. He gave the proper definition of the word in a dictionary sense.

It does not matter who exploits you in the north, Mr. Speaker: It still hurts. United States capital is as bad in its own way as capital emanating from Montreal and Toronto. It still means that we in the north have insufficient control over what is going on in the area and we, the population in that area, feel just as exploited as do the natural resources—if they could be said to have feeling—that are being extracted from the north by various companies.

The problem is that we feel to some extent isolated from the mainstream of Canadian society and without the proper assistance of various provincial governments we do not see any great opportunity for an improvement in this condition. One of the difficulties that we in northern Ontario and northern Quebec face is that most of the members in the two legislatures now come from urban areas. When our legislatures were controlled by rural legislators they had very little interest in a progressive or active form of government. Now we have moved into the second half of the twentieth century and the emphasis is the other way. The problems to be solved by the provincial legislatures, and by this one too I may say, are those based on urban development, and we in the northern areas, the exploited areas, if I may use that term, still have no feeling of properly belonging to Canadian society.

In many cases, Mr. Speaker, what we have to do when we discuss problems of this type at constitutional conferences—and these are things we shall have to take into consideration—is to break up the large sized empires that now pass for provinces. I think the time has now come when the problems involved in governing society, which are based on rural enterprises and on urban enterprises, can no longer be reconciled in the same cabinet or legislature. We have to split them apart. It might be necessary to look at the United States model and split areas that have something in common with each other into smaller parts, instead of attempting to combine them into wholes.

To carry the idea further, the new provinces which might be formed, to deal with

the problems outlined by the hon. member for Timiskaming, should be regionally based. For example one would not consider throwing the whole of northern and northwestern Ontario into one gigantic province. This would leave us in the same position we are in now. Perhaps what we should consider doing is to chop off northwestern Ontario as one separate unit, with the northeastern part and perhaps part of the northern Quebec section abutting being considered another province. In any case, problems in the north are reaching the point where the people are seething with a great deal of unrest because their needs are not being met. It is not so much a question of representation as one of limited resources, because the two large empires that pass for provinces insist on spending money on urban development. God knows how much we here see the problems of the urban areas, and recognize them, but we are also here to fight for our own areas. Our provincial colleagues are faced with the same problem. Attention is not given to the north because of the framework of political power in a particular province.

The bill introduced by the hon. member for Timiskaming is an indication of the type of problem that exists. He dealt almost exclusively with the difficulties in the north, the feeling of exploitation that we in the north have, and the lack of opportunity to make our contribution as we see it to Canadian society as a whole.

The programs that have been developed both by the federal government and the provincial governments to assist the north are not adequate. It is quite true, as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan the Islands (Mr. Cameron) has complained, that the mining companies and oil companies have been specially protected by the federal government. And indeed they were, Mr. Speaker, because that was the design of the particular subsidies when they were first introduced. It may be quite right to remove the special subsidies paid to these companies.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from the north, and mining being one of our few native industries, probably the only major one, I suggest this question should be looked at very carefully. Because capital of this type is very nervous and other mineral deposits are awaiting exploitation in other parts. We would not mind giving up this subsidy if there was something to take its place, but it is a question of our fighting for