

strategy in Canada, I really fear for our future. I fear for a country which will have to borrow over \$100 billion for energy projects alone. If that occurs, in my opinion we will be nothing more than a satellite of the United States and a satellite of huge, multinational corporations. We will be supplying more and more raw material and becoming more hewers of wood and drawers of water. I do not think we have to go in that direction, because I think we can change this economy in a really meaningful way.

I hope the minister will speak today and tell us about some real changes in Canadian trade policy which will come about. I hope he will not just say the usual things; that there will be a few more trade missions; that we are trying to sell hard, smiling a lot and trying to obtain new markets. That type of thing is not good enough any longer. I want to see some really concrete changes in direction. Why cannot we say that we do not need the Mackenzie Valley pipeline at this time, that therefore we will not go ahead with it and that we will have a moratorium on making that decision? If we have to borrow money, we could use it in a much more positive way. We could use the resources of this country, plan our economy, process our raw materials and decentralize the industrial heartland of this country so that all Canadians can feel they are a greater part of it.

As a person from the prairies, I get sick and tired, year in and year out, seeing our food materials just being shipped out in an unprocessed state, or if processed in Canada, often being processed in Toronto. That type of thing could end if we had a government which was wedded to planning and redistribution of wealth amongst the regions and not wedded to the idea of pleasing the large, multinational corporations.

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to enter this debate this afternoon on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) who, as hon. members know, is drumming up business in Southeast Asia and trying to bring about some of the things which some hon. members here are anxious to see, that is, more export sales. However, as I listened to the debate this afternoon, I must say I had some rather peculiar sensations. First, who called the debate? This is an opposition day; the Tories called the debate. They have a new leader, and they are really concerned, they say, about export sales.

An hon. Member: There is no leader here.

Mr. Gillespie: There is no leader here. The lead-off speaker, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens), disappeared as soon as he gave his speech. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) asked if he could speak second—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to bring to the attention of the House that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) was delayed on a flight from Toronto or Hamilton this afternoon. He arrived here in time for the opposition motion. He is now preparing himself for committee meetings which will be held this

Productivity and Trade

evening, and I do not think that that kind of cheap shot from the minister—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Tory members opposite might feel a little sensitive. They told the Canadian people, through their leadership convention, that they were going to come out swinging as a party. They were going to tell the people what they are for, not what they are against. They are so interested in telling us what they are for that they even leave the House. There are perhaps half a dozen in the House right now, and this is an opposition day.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Gillespie: We cannot take the Tories seriously, and I doubt very much whether the Canadian people will be able to take them seriously.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gillespie: I have a very high regard for the Conservative whip. I am not going to say anything more than this: I think we ought to check the list to see what committees are meeting this evening and find out whether the particular meeting he referred to is the kind of meeting which two of the hon. members who have spoken today are likely to attend. I leave it up to him, but we have our own ideas. I believe the committee involved is the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

As I listened to the two Tory speakers, I wondered to myself, could those two hon. members be members of the same party? The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain was suggesting that we should develop a national trading corporation; more particularly, a national buying corporation which would buy Chinese rice. He was very specific; he mentioned Chinese rice. He felt that the government of Canada should create a national institution which would go to China and buy rice. I should like to ask the hon. member and other hon. members in his party whether this is really the philosophy of the Conservative party today. Would they form a national corporation which would go to foreign countries to purchase their merchandise and then sell that merchandise in Canada in competition with the private sector? In other words, are the Tories entering the massive intervention game? Are they rejecting free enterprise on one side of their party and endorsing it on the other?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1650)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) on a point of order.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in defence of my position, I wonder if the Minister would give me his reaction to the organizations I mentioned—Favex and Excan—which were surely not Crown corporations, Liberal-style, but private corporations.