

Private Members' Business

Demand has to be there and the prices have to be worth while.

It is all well and good to go down and get the mineral but if it costs you double what you can sell it for, after a while it does not work any more. You definitely do not want to keep bringing up minerals you cannot sell. That is of no use to anybody, so I do not agree with this motion. I do not see what use it would be to anyone to have a nationalized type of market-place. First of all, I do not believe in nationalizing industries because I do not think governments run things better than private enterprise. When the government gets its hands on something, we can usually be sure that if there was a profit to be made it is gone.

• (1830)

I am not at all in favour of this motion. Perhaps the member who has proposed the motion would at some point like to sit down with me and explain why he proposed it. I know that right now there are no stockpiles in Sudbury. I do not know about his area of Timmins. However I think they are doing very well. In my area they are doing just fine. They are hoping that the demand continues the way it has been and that the prices remain at a viable level.

On the other hand, they would certainly like to see the interest levels come down and they would like to see the value of the Canadian dollar come down. I met with the president of International Nickel a couple of weeks ago. He was telling me that for every one cent the Canadian dollar increases, it costs them \$9 million in profits over a period of one year. I think they would really benefit from a loosening of the monetary policy. That would further enhance their product and cause even better returns on their investments.

I would suggest to the government that it seriously consider that and seriously consider listening to the finance committee's suggestion that the government do just that. It is a very strong point with me. I believe that that is far more important now than any marketing agency in a world-wide sense because metals are by and large sold across the world.

There is some hope as the developing countries are demanding some metals, and there is hope that it will continue into the nineties. For those areas with mines that have just closed down, I certainly would like to see

some drastic measures in encouraging other developments in mining. That would certainly be the answer to their problems.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Côté (Richmond—Wolfe): Madam Speaker, as the member for Richmond—Wolfe, I welcome this opportunity to rise in the House and speak to this motion which favours the development of a co-operative agency. The motion is of particular interest to me since I come from a mining area, asbestos, to be precise, and I have no doubts about the altruistic intentions behind the tabling of this motion. I think the hon. member is to be commended for initiating this debate, but I would like to explain my point of view which does not quite coincide with the hon. member's philosophy. I will present my arguments, Madam Speaker.

When Prime Minister Mulroney's government came to power in 1984, it made it clear that it was prepared to let market forces prevail. In fact, the most impressive measures taken to that end were the government's decision to cancel the National Energy Program and to privatize a number of Crown corporations. We all know what happened. Today, however, despite the success of these initiatives, we have before us a motion that, if I am not mistaken, would allow governments at all levels to exercise even greater influence on market forces.

If I understand the motion correctly, the underlying philosophy is that the government is in a better position than industry to market its products, that the government has failed to consult sufficiently with all parties concerned when it develops or implements policies and strategies aimed at promoting Canadian mineral exports, and finally, that the government does not do enough to encourage those exports.

I suggest we take a closer look at these assumptions, with which I must say I disagree. More than ten years ago, Madam Speaker, the government of all major western economies, after realizing that it was necessary to do so, adopted a non-interventionist approach to markets, letting market forces develop freely so that private industry could become more competitive. That is how business function in a western society. This approach enhances the efficiency and competitive edge of the economy while accelerating the accumulation of wealth. It has been so successful in most western countries that today, we are seeing and unprecedented development in modern socialist systems. In a number of socialist countries, the economic system, entirely based on government intervention, has literally crumbled. This revolution is not due to people adopting some new philosophy. It is the result of competitive and economic