

We need some new approaches, none of which were hinted at in the Speech from the Throne. We need a removal of the 11 per cent tax on building materials for housing. We need active programs in conjunction with the provinces and cities to make more serviced lots available in order to bring down the price of lots. We need inducements, not pleas to lenders to put their money into housing. We need an active program.

Let me refer to urban problems. Here again, the best that one can say is that we have lost two years. I think the problem is worse than it was two years ago in terms of urban renewal and assistance to transportation. Again, we have had nothing much except talk as far as the government is concerned. I welcome the appointment of a minister in this area. If the government had been prepared to do this a couple of years ago, the minister who was then in charge might have been prepared to serve the government and push forward a policy. This approach has simply lapsed for the last two years, yet I cannot help but ask—as perhaps that same Member of Parliament is still asking—how much this statement in the Speech from the Throne really means.

One must go back to the statement made by the Prime Minister in this House in a debate on February 14, 1969, when he said:

Until the constitution is brought into the 20th century, governments are, to a large degree, powerless to solve the problems either by activity alone or in co-operation—

This statement was made during a debate in the House of Commons on urban affairs. To what extent, then, has the Prime Minister's mind really been opened, and to what extent will he really allow the new minister to tackle this problem of the cities with earnestness? We shall have to see.

As to environment generally, we still have no body in this country that is responsible for examining the effects of our total environment. To date, there has been no adequate co-ordination of antipollution efforts within federal services. I welcome the new department. We and many others have been advocating this new department and we hope it will enable the federal government to co-ordinate its own activities within this area of fighting pollution. There is still no suggestion of any adequate authority or mechanism to co-ordinate antipollution efforts throughout the country. There is no suggestion of any body which would have the overriding responsibility for surveying and advising on the protection of our total environment. The department is fine as far as it goes, but we also need an environmental council.

I realize that there are many who are very concerned about the deterioration of our environment but who would also consider the preservation of our environment inconsistent with our economic growth.

I certainly agree that we must not worship the gross national product and that we must have a higher objective than that. But I want to make it very clear that I believe we shall need continued economic growth for some time to come, at least if we are to tackle our problems of unemployment and poverty and if we are to finance the social plans we have adopted, the measures such as educational programs in which we are involved. This does not mean for a moment that we ought not to

#### *The Address—Mr. Stanfield*

be examining the environmental effects of certain forms of economic development and growth or, on the other hand, conducting certain forms of examination. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no sign in the Speech from the Throne of any awareness of these problems. We need more than a department. We also need an organ to guarantee the preservation of the total environment in our country.

Sir, there are many other areas I could touch on, areas such as external affairs. Because of the white paper that was produced, probably the less said about that the better. Yet there is a question of great importance, of great concern to many Canadians, that I should like to touch on before sitting down. It is the question of Canadian sovereignty, the question of economic autonomy. What do Canadians want? I think Canadians want to have pride in themselves and in their country. They want to be sure that we have a government that is looking after the national interest, a government that is concerned with the interests of all Canadians taken as individuals and as Canadian citizens. I think we want a Canada that is friendly to the United States while keeping its distance. We want a country that intends to preserve its autonomy. What has the government done?

It has jumped from one position to another—at least, its ministers have. It has gone from insipid continentalism to insulting attacks on the United States, and back again.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** It has gone from an apparently abject fear of the United States adverse reaction on declarations concerning Arctic sovereignty to rather petty squabbling in other spheres. This is a sign of weakness, not of strength. The government has floundered out of its depth on the question of the control of our economy. There are times when it seems to be saying that the question is not really important; but there are other times when one seems to be able to detect some concern on the part of the government. Once again we have a climate of uncertainty. We owe it to our respective investors, we owe it to our economy and, above all, we owe it to the Canadian people to dissipate this uncertainty.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** I will not go through all the perambulations of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). They are pretty well known. As for the Prime Minister, let me say this. When he took over the leadership of his party, it was generally understood that he had a very poor opinion of nationalism. The subject may be of no interest to him. I think it would interest the Canadian people to know what his views are on this question today. Certainly, there is very little in the Speech from the Throne which can give any indication.

What do we propose? I propose an approach based on realism and on the survival of all Canada. We need foreign investment, foreign technology and initiative in order to maintain our prosperity. Yet, surely we can reach a policy which protects the interests of our own country. What I am suggesting is that we need a flexible