

*The Address—Mr. Fleming*

the years. Alberta accused Ottawa of not consulting. The Premier of that province actually refused at one time to talk to the federal government. At one point he even threatened to sever relations. That is great Canadianism! Yet the same Premier developed the Syncrude plan over many months. He drew up a deal directly involving federal revenues. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) heard about Syncrude in a television newscast in a hotel room in Calgary.

Canada is blessed with almost unparalleled opportunities. We know that, despite the leering of my friends opposite. We have unparalleled opportunities, and we have a federal government listening to problems in all regions of Canada, especially the west although there is little political advantage to that at the moment. We have these almost unparalleled opportunities through no planning or foresight of our own. Canada—or is it just Alberta and Saskatchewan—is rich in resources; but the maritimes, Quebec, northern Ontario, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon have some real pockets of poverty and regional inequity.

If in practice there have been failures, or at least delays in helping Canada, has the spirit of our nation and its regions ever been “the haves shall have it and the have-nots shall not”? Were government omissions, shortsightedness or insensitivities in the past, at any level, ever a justification for that approach now or in the future? No matter how strident my friends opposite are regarding the past, in the long run who will suffer from a course of confrontation, regionalism or politically fortified frustration? Not the west in this case. Only, and especially, those Canadians who have suffered most all along.

● (1610)

No government in recent times has, with fewer political rewards to reap, concentrated more on seeking solutions to problems and inequities in western Canada. Never before in Canadian history—and I include my own province—has any region stood on the threshold of so much wealth and economic well-being as Canada's west. Before any oil embargo was announced by Arabia, this government volunteered to go into the lion's den and seek out the abscesses. Thus the western economic opportunities conference. It continues pledged and obliged to correct the wrongs of which the west has complained. Surely those pledges would not otherwise have been put so clearly in the Speech from the Throne, and the government would not have gone out west if they had not been prepared to do that. I only hope the pioneer spirit of westerners, of which we hear them speak and of which they are so proud—and so they should be—will make them Canadians first as their fate-found abundance moves them into the forefront of the Canadian economy in the decade ahead. There can be no doubt this is what their position will be.

The inequities in freight rates are to be remedied. Western farmers will prosper on a continuing basis as they never have before. The industrial development of the west will boom, as it has begun to do already, for instance in Medicine Hat, with the assistance of DREE. Over and above all this, the west's abundance of energy assures it of unparalleled wealth. Surely it is a time when Canadianism, not regionalism, should be bursting from them and from their leaders.

[Mr. Fleming.]

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I join with others who have preceded me in this debate in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I propose to deal with one subject and one subject only, and that is Canada's position in the international world.

I note that apart from a reference to the effect of the fuel crisis on the third world, there is no mention in the Speech from the Throne to international affairs. This is perhaps because, it must be acknowledged, international affairs are not the most attractive subject politically. Nevertheless, they are of tremendous importance to Canada. It is obvious that neither Canada nor any other modern nation can live in isolation, and it is trite to remark that the world is getting smaller and increasingly interdependent. Canada's welfare and even her survival depend on peace and security in the world as a whole, and we are bound to pay attention to the subject.

It is said that international affairs should be treated on a non-partisan basis. To some extent I agree with this statement. There are, naturally, many aspects of Canada's international relations upon which Canadians of all parties are in substantial agreement, and in such cases they can and should work together. However, there are very real differences of outlook and real differences in regard to international policy on specific issues. It is, in my view, worth while discussing these differences here.

I propose, therefore, to put emphasis on the points on which there is disagreement between my party, the New Democratic Party, and the present administration. I think it will become apparent that these differences are very real. First of all, I think there is a substantial philosophic difference. The government, in 1970, introduced a series of papers under the general title “Foreign Policy for Canadians.” These papers reveal what can only be described as a desire to maintain a low profile in international affairs and a weariness with such activities as peacekeeping and, generally, a reaction against overemphasizing Canada's role.

We recognize, of course, that Canada is not, in terms of military power or influence, a major actor on the international scene. We believe, however, that there are aspects of international affairs in which Canada's leadership is both natural and essential. I refer to such questions as the development of international law in the protection of human rights and in the whole field of humanitarian internationalism.

We share with some other countries an obligation to give leadership. I mention, for example, Sweden, Australia, Holland, West Germany, Norway, Denmark and New Zealand. There are, of course, many countries in the so-called third world which are in a similar position. We have not had, in my view, the clarity, precision, vigour or dynamic leadership which Canada could have given in these fields. There has been lack of a sense of urgency. In my view there is an urgent need to build a world community. The present administration, according to its own declarations, and indeed according to its practice, tends to put emphasis on narrow national self-interest and upon economic growth. For example, we find in “Foreign Policy for Canadians” six ingredients of Canadian foreign policy as follows: