

Natural Resources—Development

in an offensive to secure control of the economic things so necessary to the maintenance of the military machines.

In recent years we in this party have over and over again endeavoured to secure on the part of the government a determination to launch in Canada a national policy of development, not one that is effective only in certain parts of Canada but one that will be universal and apply to every part of the country, one that will prevent the present situation whereby certain provinces find themselves frozen in underdevelopment and other provinces, because of their greater resources, are enabled to advance and to increase their trade and their industrial production.

Going back over the years, because it is of this situation that I intend to speak today, we in this party have consistently endeavoured to bring to the attention of the house the necessity for the launching of a program of extensive national development. The Minister of Trade and Commerce gave certain figures today indicating that total capital expenditures were \$8½ billion during last year, an increase of 8.9 per cent. That in no way meets the challenge that we have over and over again brought to the attention of the government, that whatever the amount of capital expenditures may be those capital expenditures are not reasonably distributed across the country. In the result, various provinces—I refer particularly to the maritimes and the province of Saskatchewan in the west—find themselves unable to have that type of economic advancement which other provinces, more blessed with the resources of power than are the areas in question, have been able to achieve.

On June 16, 1952, as recorded at page 3263 of *Hansard*, this party presented a motion moved by Mr. Drew and seconded by the late Mr. Graydon in these words:

... whereas the natural resources of Canada are a heritage that should be developed and conserved for the purpose of providing the greatest possible measure of opportunity and security for all Canadians this house is of the opinion that immediate consideration should be given to a national policy under a system of free enterprise and in close association and collaboration with the provinces that will:

(a) promote and develop all the country's natural resources for the benefit of the people of every part of Canada;

I emphasize those words and say that the events that have taken place since indicate that in the view then expressed we were entirely correct in our evaluation of the situation.

(b) protect and conserve our forest, mineral and other resources from undue depletion or exhaustion;

(c) expand the use of our resources for industrial production in Canada and thus create greater opportunities for employment and advancement of Canadians.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Later, in 1955, a further motion was presented by way of amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It was moved by the then acting leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) and it proposed that action should be taken for this, among other purposes:

To facilitate and encourage the processing of our natural resources in Canada, and thereby increase opportunities and employment for Canadians.

Then, on the 9th of July, 1956, less than a year ago, a motion was presented by Mr. Drew, seconded by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming), in these words:

This house is of the opinion that the welfare of the Canadian people requires the adoption now of a national development policy which will develop our natural resources for the maximum benefit of all parts of Canada, encourage more processing of those resources in Canada, correct the present serious unfavourable trade balances, foster wider financial participation by Canadians in the development of our resources, and promote greater opportunity and employment for a steadily increasing population.

That was in July of 1956. That was when the Gordon commission was engaged in hearing evidence across this country, a commission which cost Canada at least \$1 million and which by its report has given support to almost every one of the points raised by this party in July of 1956 and back through the years to 1952. Yet we hear nothing about what the government intends to do with the Gordon report. Is the report to be embalmed? There has been a thunderous silence on the part of the government with respect to the action that it intends to take in this regard. The only words that have been spoken have been words of condemnation by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) and by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Is it not a strange thing that the report of the Gordon commission, which was referred to in such warm terms in July last by members of the government, which was going to set forth in detail the course to be taken by Canada, which would be the instrument whereby the government would have information upon which it could act, has at this session been filed and forgotten? It has been put away in mothballs. I asked the Prime Minister on one occasion what the government intended to do, and in effect the answer was that at this session the government had no program in this regard.

Will the government say what portions of the report will receive its imprimatur? We know there are certain portions that have already received the utmost condemnation from the government. It is a strange thing that this commission, which was to be the chart, the compass of Canada's future in the