

resource development in Canada than any of the provisions in Bill C-219. The very fact that the government has included this northern orientation in the Crown corporations brought under the umbrella of the CDC, is, as I say, implicit recognition of this fact.

Actually, if we are going to deal with the fundamental economic problems that a corporation of this kind is supposed to become concerned with, we have to move in quite radically different directions. Some of these fundamental problems relate to underdevelopment in western Canada and the Maritime provinces. I see nothing in the proposed legislation that will encourage Canadian resource and manufacturing development in areas where this is urgently needed. As a matter of fact, as far as the north is concerned, instead of continuing the initiatives that were taken in the early 1960's the government has tended to discourage this sort of activity by cancelling roads to resources programs. One area where governments can play a useful role in encouraging initiative on the part of private enterprise is in providing the infrastructure—the roads, railways and all facilities necessary—to enable private enterprise to develop Canada's resource potential. But instead of this we find the government tending to back away from its fundamental responsibilities. When the CDC is established it will be highly profit oriented. It will only develop areas where the profit potential is extremely high, and therefore the question of dealing with risk ventures will not be assisted by any manner or means.

This leads me to the discussion that took place in the House earlier today. There has been some criticism that the opposition is less than co-operative with the government in its legislative proposals and initiatives. This criticism has come from the Member of Parliament who holds the highest office in the land, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Queen's first minister. I think our discussion of the CDC at this stage makes it possible to put the record in perspective.

Why are we concerning ourselves at this time with a bill which offers absolutely no chance of dealing with the fundamental economic issues facing Canada? Why are we dealing with this issue when we should be debating, for example, amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act? This is a matter of vital importance in view of the critical and growing unemployment situation in Canada. Why is a bill of this kind taking precedence over the implementation of the recommendations contained in the white paper on tax reform? Parliament has been waiting for many months now for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to bring down his proposed legislation based on the long and extensive discussion of his white paper proposals. Why is priority given to this bill, which is window dressing, political posturing, a bill designed to create the impression that the government is doing something to cope with fundamental economic problems when actually it does nothing significant at all?

• (12:50 p.m.)

I am sure if the government put amendments before us—

Canada Development Corporation

Mr. McBride: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Does he also consider the marketing bill, which has been held up for about a year now, to be window dressing?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It seems to the Chair that the question asked by the hon. member can only lead us further away from the bill now under consideration.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked a question and I am very pleased to reply to it. If the agricultural products marketing bill goes through—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has indicated that the question as asked is irrelevant to the bill now under discussion. If the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) answers the question, he will lead this debate away from the subject matter of the measure now before the House. With all respect, I would ask him to bear that in mind.

Mr. Dinsdale: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I was just making the point that there were other legislative items which should be given greater priority than the Canada Development Corporation. Obviously, the hon. member thinks the agricultural marketing bill is one item of government legislation which should have greater priority.

Mr. McBride: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Again, the Chair must say that the question asked by the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) is irrelevant to the subject matter now being debated I suggest that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris should continue his remarks.

Mr. Dinsdale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall follow your directions and carry on with the theme of my remarks. I presume the hon. member was merely trying to introduce a red herring to the discussion.

Mr. McBride: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. McBride: Mr. Speaker, in no sense did I introduce a red herring. The hon. member for Brandon-Souris suggested there were other more important bills before the House.

An hon. Member: Leave it until Sunday.

Mr. McBride: I suggest that the opposition has prevented many of these bills from coming before the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has been carefully following the remarks of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris and feels they have been related to the bill now before us. I suggest to the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) that his initial question could only lead the House to a renewed debate