

now, we may yet create a viable manufacturing industry in this underdeveloped country of ours. If we do not, I fear the consequences.

In a recent speech before the Vancouver Institute, J. B. Klein, a former board chairman of MacMillan-Bloedel and a former British Columbia supreme court judge, said that parliamentary democracy is becoming less responsible to the people, and we may have to change our system of government. I am sure he had the American congressional system in mind. Mr. Klein concluded by saying that if we do not get business in general, and manufacturing in particular, moving and moving soon in our country, Canadians may well insist that we change our system. Along with this, as has been said in recent days in the House, it is obvious there must be something resembling industrial strategy. We must have more forward planning in the area of industries—short, medium and long term. Therefore, we have a great deal to do to put our own house in order.

I said that I would not speak very long, but in closing I would not feel right without mentioning the other dimension of our trade and economic problems, which is the international effect on our economy. I am referring to trade, which would bring us prosperity and some stability in the world, and also to offering aid and development to those who need it the most. We have problems with our wealthy, industrialized, western trading partners; there is no question about that. Hopefully these will be ironed out at GATT, although the process will be very difficult.

With regard to the second world, the communist world, we need to trade with them more than we are at the present time. Certainly we cannot afford to let them lapse into isolation. That would be very, very dangerous politically and militarily. Yet we have to be very careful in our trade with them for obvious reasons. We have to walk the tightrope with the second world. If Canada is going to make a breakthrough, the real challenge will be in the area of the so-called third world, which is sometimes referred to now as the third and fourth worlds because of Arab oil wells. Some of those countries have slipped back farther now than they were before.

As I indicated previously, we will have to continue offering aid; there is no question about that. It is for our own sake and for their sake. Of course, the real answer is in trade, as well as helping them to develop their own resources in order for them to become healthy trading partners like our present western trading partners, rather than charity cases. Within that umbrella of development, which will be a long and difficult process in many cases, we must start paying more attention and making more effort in certain areas that will assist development.

I am not referring only to areas which would help directly. I am also referring to areas which would not inhibit efforts third world countries are making to become healthy trading partners. One such area is population. We have not talked about that too much in the House. I would like to talk about that at length some time. I had hoped to in the last debate on external affairs, but unfortunately it did not work out. Like many subjects in the area of international affairs, this is a subject

### *Supply*

which must come into its own again very soon. That is not just because of the human social implication, but also because of the very practical material implications for us as well as the third world countries.

Under the sponsorship of the United Nations, a new worldwide parliamentarians group working on population and development is being formed. Recently I was very pleased to be asked to chair that worldwide group of parliamentarians. I think we will begin to accomplish things in the very near future. I hope the House will hear more on that debate. In both senses and dimensions, both international and domestic, we have quite a job to do. I have every confidence that the government will achieve those challenges.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, we are seeing something tonight which I have not seen in the number of years I have been in parliament. It is approximately a year since we have had a budget in Canada. Tonight we saw the Minister of Finance (Mr. Chrétien) refer to a document which he read from. Sometimes he calls it a budget, sometimes he calls it an economic statement. Once again tonight he referred to it as a budget. As was indicated by our finance critic in the debate in answer to the minister this evening, we are almost never allowed to question the minister on that. According to the rules of the House, we are only allowed to question him for a few moments. Under the rules of the House, we are not permitted to have a six-day debate.

We are now into that period of parliamentary history where there is an uncertainty. We are witnessing this place decaying and dying, because we are moving into a period where there is likely to be a federal election. If my memory serves me correctly, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came into the House and announced that there would be four or five by-elections on October 16. We know he did that with a smirk on his face, and that he had no intention of holding those by-elections on that date. Whether the Prime Minister has let his cabinet in on the secret or not, he has planned with his advisers to announce an election between now and October 16. Also we know between now and that date that perhaps there will not be a budget.

Surely I can speak so that Canadians will understand when we talk about billions. For example, we have been told that this year's deficit is greater than Canada's entire budget when the Prime Minister and his gang took over in 1968. The minister read a statement tonight in a manner similar to that of an elementary schoolboy reading from a text book. Never before have I witnessed either a Liberal or Conservative minister of finance reading in such a manner. Since I have not experienced the New Democratic Party in office federally, I cannot criticize them in this regard.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Just stick around.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I have never seen such an inept and economically illiterate minister of finance in my lifetime. He entered the chamber and insulted the House by reading from a statement and refusing a simple, ordinary request. We were