

we have had products of wood made from wood grown in Finland arrive in Toronto. Somehow the Finnish people are able to produce lumber and sell it at competitive prices in Toronto, in a country which if it has nothing else at least has a lot of wood.

I agree that the principle behind this bill is very good because I think we are beginning to tell ourselves two things. First, the more we can put into a product in terms of skill, effort and intelligent work, the more our return will be from it. That is fairly obvious. The other thing we are beginning to learn is that the most important aspect in the production of a resource is not the wages we gain through the production of the resource, not even the profits that the exploiting companies make in developing the resource, and indeed not even the taxes that we can gather from taxing the profits of the exploitation of that resource. The most important aspect of the production of a resource is the end use. Who is it in this world who will benefit ultimately from the use of the resource which we produce? We are now beginning to see the light, that the end use of the product is the most important aspect of the production of that product. We are now beginning to see the light and tell ourselves, very slowly I grant, that perhaps it is not to our benefit to try to flog all of our resources on the world market, but that perhaps it is to our benefit to put Canadian needs first.

The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) made the point, very effectively and succinctly, that we have to begin developing an industrial policy for this country which will satisfy the needs of the people first. One of the absolutely essential notions behind an effective industrial policy for Canada would be one that would insulate the people of Canada from the vagaries of the world market. They know this country can produce enough to satisfy their real needs.

We have all the right in the world to wonder, these days particularly, why it is that the prices of the goods we produce in abundance are getting beyond our reach. Perhaps the economists, those practitioners of the dismal science, may try to explain how it is that a commodity they produce in abundance can be priced beyond their reach; but the good people of Canada, in the main simple, direct folk, will refuse to understand that kind of casuistry, and they will be absolutely right. They, along with many other people and some people in this House, are beginning to understand that what we must do in order to develop an industrial policy to satisfy Canada's needs first is to begin attacking two of the great unquestioned tenets of our industrial economic philosophy in this country. The first is that we must export whatever we can not only to survive but to thrive; the second is that in order to have wellbeing we must have economic growth.

Some members of this House may say that what I am saying is absolute heresy. I can understand that they think this way, because the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) stood up a few weeks ago in this House and said that the ultimate objective of the economy is to create jobs. What utter absurdity! Surely the ultimate objective of the economy is not to produce work but to produce wellbeing, in the same way as the objective of the exploiters of the resources or commodities of a country is to produce satisfaction and wellbeing for the people living in that country,

Export and Import Permits

not simply to flog the resources as quickly as possible for whatever profit can be made by the exploiting corporations.

I will end by making one single observation, and it is this. In the history of this world, those countries whose economies have tended to have a large export quotient have been the poor countries. Conversely, generally speaking, those countries which were wealthy were countries which had developed and well balanced internal economies which consumed the major part of their production. Many small countries in this world, countries which we call underdeveloped, can boast of having a very high export quotient, but the higher the export quotient very often the poorer the country.

● (2150)

Because it is a step in the right direction, I support this bill. I would be in favour of seeing the bill define the powers that are listed. It would be much more clear and perhaps indeed should be mandatory. But nevertheless it is a small step, and perhaps the first light of the dawn of a new day. I think that in a few years from now, maybe 25 years or so, Canadians will wonder how practically the entire population of the country could have accepted as an article of faith the thesis that a total drive for ever greater exportation, particularly of unfinished goods, could have led to the wellbeing of the people of this country. As I say, because it is a step in the right direction I am glad to lend the bill my support.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, it seems to have become quite a habit with those members who apparently still support the government that every time a bill comes before this parliament they say: Let us have the question, let us have closure immediately and get on with something else. I do not know what they think the purpose of parliament is if members are not given some opportunity to debate a bill such as Bill C-4.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We have heard your speech before. It is the same speech.

Mr. Stevens: This is a new one. Yesterday evening when I spoke on another bill I mentioned that we had already indicated to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) that if he wished to bring this bill forward we would give it a speedy passage and not delay it. The hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) indicated that we were willing to see this bill go to committee and that we support it in its broad outline. But that does not mean that the members of my caucus or any other member of the House should be denied the right to speak on this bill. I say that because I think it is unfortunate, for example, that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was not in the House to introduce the bill although the acting minister made a good presentation.

I think it is particularly relevant to point out that the report that we are proposing to amend in this bill has not yet been tabled in the House of Commons. I am referring to the report that is required by section 26 of the act, which provides that as soon as practicable after the 31st day of December of each year the minister shall prepare and lay before parliament a report on the operations under this act for that year. I have checked with the library and I