

did the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis), and as did the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), a Progressive Conservative member. If more Members of Parliament would do that instead of playing little partisan games, then perhaps the respect of the people of Canada for this institution would be much higher.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nystrom: This afternoon I want to raise a couple of important issues that I believe should be changed. We should be taking a close look at them. We all know about the structural problems that we have. The hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap and others have mentioned the 8 per cent unemployment rate, the 11.5 per cent inflation rate and the very high interest rates. Structurally, we have an economy that is based on a branch plant mentality. We have branch plants of foreign-based transnational corporations in Canada that are basically producing many of the goods and services that we have.

If Samuel de Champlain were alive today, I suppose he would be very happy because back in 1608 when he established the first colonies in Quebec they were established to ship beaver pelts and furs to France from Canada. I suppose he would be very happy to know that we have graduated from beaver pelts to gas, oil, timber and coal. However, we are still exporting raw materials basically unfinished and importing finished goods from other parts of the world.

We have no leadership. We have no vision. We have Liberal members across the way criticizing us because we are talking about some hope and some optimism. We have an economy that is basically a tag-along-economy, tagging along with the United States and other parts of the world, literally shadowing the United States. In 1980, we began to see the consequences of this when we saw our unemployment rise and we witnessed \$5.5 billion flowing out of Canada in dividends and profits to shareholders in other parts of the world. What I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that we need a new Canada, we need a new vision of what we can do in this country. We have to give people some hope that we can rebuild and restructure our country in the way that the Japanese, the French and the Germans did after World War II when those countries were totally and absolutely destroyed. They rose from the ruins to build great industrial states which are stronger in terms of their economy today than Canada, the greatest country in the world in terms of resources, of educated people, and of the future. We are falling further and further behind. I think it is time our nation became a nation. It is time that Canada became Canadian. It is time we asserted our sovereignty, Canadianized our economy and put Canadians in control of their own destiny. It is time we allowed ordinary working people to make decisions over their own lives.

● (1610)

Because of time limitations, Mr. Speaker, I only want to refer today to one area where I think we need some really fundamental structural changes, the area of trade. I do so for

Supply

the fundamental reason that about 30 per cent of our GNP is tied to trade. That means an awful lot in terms of the national economy and in terms of jobs, and in western Canada, where both I and the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap come from it is even higher than 30 per cent.

We have in this country, Mr. Speaker, a very small domestic market. Indeed, of the seven greatest trading nations in the world, we have the smallest domestic market. Since that is so, we must be a trading nation and we must become more competitive and more specialized in what we are doing. If you look at what has happened over the last few years in Canada, I would suggest to the House that I think we have become the boy scouts of international trade. As a result, we have become the doormat for many countries around the world. Look at what the Japanese said to the Minister of State for Trade (Mr. Lumley) in Tokyo just yesterday when he went there confident of negotiating a new deal under which we would restrict, to a certain degree, the importing of Japanese cars and we would have a new arrangement worked out. The Japanese have said no, and the minister's mission to Japan was a total failure.

In 1969, Mr. Speaker, Canada had 6 per cent of world trade; we now have 3.9 per cent. In 1972 we had 4 per cent of world trade in manufacturing; in 1979 we had 2.8 per cent. We had a deficit in 1970 in finished products of \$2.5 billion; in 1981 it was \$21 billion. My friend, the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap, referred to mining equipment and machinery. In 1980 our deficit there was \$5.7 billion. In 1980 we had a deficit in automobiles, trucks, parts and aircraft of \$4.2 billion. These statistics tell us that something is fundamentally wrong. I want to be very honest and say it is not exclusively the fault of the federal government. The government is the leader, the supreme court of the land, and I think it has to be number one in terms of responsibility. However, this also reflects on provincial governments, on our business community, indeed on our nation as a whole. Therefore, I think we will have to make sure that trade becomes a bigger priority in our country if we are to survive.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, 30 per cent of our GNP is tied to trade. That is evenly split between goods and services. If you look at some of the other leading nations of the world, you will find that they are much less dependent on trade. The United States and Japan depend on trade for only about 10 per cent or 15 per cent of their GNP at most. This is why I am concerned about the growing wave of protectionism in our world, because if that happens, as it did in the 1930s, we will be hit harder than almost any other country because we trade more than almost any other country. In addition, more of our trade is with the industrial world. In fact, less than 10 per cent of our trade is with the developing world. We trade very little with the Bangladeshs or Chinas of the world. We trade mainly with the United States, the European Common Market and Japan. However, the European Common Market, for example, has about 20 per cent of its trade with the developing world, the United States has more than one third and the Japanese have about one half. So what happens when the industrial giants start becoming more protectionist? What happens when the