

missing in the Speech from the Throne. What we see is not a neutral position but, rather, a tendency toward greater intervention by government, more regulation and, hence, slower economic growth. I had thought that Professor Helmut Schmidt had taught his pupil a good lesson in 1978. Clearly, Professor Galbraith is now in charge, and we are now moving back to the musings of 1975.

The speech says that Canadians want more effective government, not necessarily less government. In view of the record of how successful the previous Liberal government has been in providing effective government, I read into this that the Liberals are now moving solidly toward more government in terms of cost of government and degree of regulation and intervention.

Regardless of the political philosophies of parties in this House, it must be abundantly clear that we are very close to the point where we cannot afford more government. A review of the impact of government regulation on economic efficiency and productivity will clearly lead to the conclusion that increased regulation in many cases reduces job opportunities, which is a particularly critical observation at a time when there are more than one million people unemployed in this country.

On looking at the specifics of the economic proposals, I must say that I was excited by the statement that "Canada's resource base will be used as a basic building block of our industrial policy". However, my excitement stopped there. One of the tragedies of this past election and the period since the election has been the inability of this government to allow its vision to range past the desire for short-term political gain by emphasizing the short-term costs of the energy policy which our government had evolved. It is far more important in the long run to grasp the opportunity given to us of the vast amount of energy development ahead. If Canadians pull together in support of the energy future of this country, I am convinced that the energy potential of Canada can build a major arch between the west and the rest of Canada.

The industrial activity which will be generated in eastern Canada by investment in the energy business throughout Canada will dwarf anything we have yet seen in this country. That is the opportunity, and I strongly believe that the national interest was served by the Conservative government energy policy. To be sure, there was a cost, and there will be a cost which is shared by Canadians; but the opportunity was also to be shared by Canadians from all parts of the country, both in terms of energy security and economic development. Unfortunately, the political myopia of this government has not allowed it to seize upon this opportunity.

I would like just to dwell on a few figures. Canada needs some \$300 billion to \$400 billion of investment in its energy sector alone during the next decade, and at least double that in the 1990s. That compares with our total national income—our total gross national product—today of some \$260 billion. That is a 1979 figure. This represents a tremendous amount of business activity not only by the oil and gas industry, the electrical industry and pipeline companies themselves but also

The Address—Mr. Wilson

by all the supplier companies of steel and of high technology machinery and equipment.

Today far too much of this is imported. I urge the government to set as a top priority the establishment of policies to win the maximum amount of this business for Canadian companies. This will create jobs, improve our balance of trade, create a strong technological base in Canada and put us in a position in the future to dominate these industries in the world market. All of the ingredients are there for a major Canadian success story. This opportunity will drift into a major problem if the government does not address it.

Let me comment briefly on the proposal to create a national trading company. I welcome this initiative to help small and medium-sized business develop export markets. Earlier this year through the Export Development Corporation the Clark government announced a series of measures designed to make it easier for these companies to enlist the support of the EDC. Other measures were under active discussion. I am concerned, however, that this national trading company should not be launched in such a way that it will drown small business in bureaucracy and red tape. What is needed is an efficient means whereby business can respond quickly to export opportunities with confidence that the trading company will be able to respond in like fashion.

I suggest that the government consider the alternative of tax or other assistance to encourage greater development of smaller, more flexible trading companies. These companies would be privately owned and managed by entrepreneurs, not bureaucrats who have no profit orientation.

I would like to comment briefly on one perspective of the changing environment in the province of Quebec. I have been honoured to participate in this debate and to listen to many hon. members from both sides of the House commenting on the changing nature of things that have been happening in a very dynamic way in Quebec in recent months and years. It has been a privilege for me to listen, particularly to those hon. members opposite who are living with this dynamic situation and who have been put into a position where, in many cases, they are living in a very divisive environment. I congratulate them on the efforts they are making in their own constituencies, and I can only speak as strongly as I can for the people of Etobicoke Centre when I say that I wish them the best of luck in the efforts they are making in their own constituencies.

• (1510)

Going back to my own experience in the business world, in my early years as a businessman I was quite uncomfortable with some of my English colleagues and acquaintances in the Montreal business community. Attitudes on the part of these men toward their French-speaking associates were a real throwback to long-forgotten days in other parts of the world. I was not as perceptive then, but it was quite clear that these attitudes just had to change. I did not know how they were going to change or how quickly they were going to change, but in recent years they have changed quickly and in a very fundamental fashion. The reasons are varied, but the basic fact