Government Orders

participate in the business of selling arms around the world.

The most recent figures show that the average annual sales or export of arms by Canada reached \$1.5 billion, earning Canada a place in the top 15 military suppliers in the 1980s, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

The real issue now is how we are going to begin to turn this around.

The member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has been for his whole political career a defender of the position of workers in British Columbia and across Canada.

I would like to give him the opportunity to outline his thoughts on how workers in this situation should best be looked after and protected. Is it to pass a bill like this, or does the member have, as I know he does, alternatives in mind?

Mr. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, someone suggested that was a planted question.

Unfortunately, our planning was not good today and it is not a planted question.

I will address it in terms of a global view since the minister whom I quoted was taking a global view. Let us take, for example, one area of government policy, the export of oil and natural gas.

If this government were serious about building a sovereign, firm, industrial base in this country to provide meaningful jobs for Canadians, it would cut down on our export of raw materials, particularly oil and gas, and start building an industrial base on those energy products.

Why, for example, are we shipping our Canadian oil into the United States and subsidizing American truckers' jobs with cheap Canadian crude oil that is made from both light and heavy oil into industrial products, and for industrial use in transportation? Why are we doing that?

We could put a surtax on exported oil to force the Americans to bring the price of their transportation costs up to our level. Just as this government acquiesced to a surtax on forest industry goods from British Columbia, we should do the other.

• (1230)

What would we do with the money? We would expand the industrial base. Alberta could be the foundation of a major petrochemical industry. Certainly the export of LNG should be a consideration for western Canada. We should be building ships in this country after the United Nations' admonition that 40 per cent of all raw materials leaving any nation should go on that nation's ships, built by that nation's shipyards, and manned by that nation's crews. We don't have a merchant fleet left any more.

These are not things of startling revelation, but my colleague asked me to give a couple of examples of what we could be doing if we were a government of determination. Those are things that are simple and that would more than employ tens of thousands of people in this country. Part of the price of doing business with the Japanese in terms of the export of LNG, which I favour, would be to do it through ships built in Canada, manned by Canadian crews. Why not? There is a whole range of things.

Is the selling of arms the only thing that we have left to create jobs. Is that the lack of vision? I cannot believe it. We have highly skilled and highly paid professionals within the bureaucracy of this government who can come up with these ideas and many others.

I am not a Christian, but I noted with some interest that the member ended up his comments with a quote from one of the prophets, about beating your weapons into ploughshares. I puzzle about Christians sometimes. Do they really mean what they say? All those prayer breakfasts that the members of Parliament go to, is it a charade? This trade in arms is immoral. It is against what we say in daily prayer in this Chamber, and yet we are going to go ahead with it. That is hypocrisy, too. I wonder about it.

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in a quiet temperate way on this bill, because it does not deserve the kind of hyperbole that we have had to listen to for the last 25 minutes. The facts behind this bill are rather dull and mundane and bureaucratic. They have nothing to do with the great questions of principle that the hon. member wanted to bring forward, nothing to do with the