

legislation to restructure the advisory committee because they want elements of industry in the committee. That is fine. Their financial recommendations are along the following lines: debt financing assistance should be similar to that available in other countries engaged in marine activities. I see the minister raising his eyebrows and shaking his head—nobody has told him about this. They propose that future legislation should recognize the advantages of leasing. Shipbuilding assistance should be available at appropriate rates, shipbuilding capital subsidies for new construction or major conversions, and tax incentives.

● (2122)

It seems that the EDC can wander about the world, conclude contracts with Greece, France, the United Kingdom, Panama, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Cuba and Senegal and build ships for these countries while our shipbuilding industry is asking for assistance. Why is there not, even one fraction of the EDC funds available to Canadian industry on the same terms as are available to foreign buyers? It is as simple as that.

An hon. Member: It is as simple as the minister.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I find it extraordinary that the minister and the EDC should be touting these wares and asking for an increase in the loan limits—and I hope I am right about this—to \$26 billion.

Mr. Stevens: Loans and insurance.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Loans and insurance, and if I remember correctly this is from something like \$4 billion at the present time, maybe \$10 billion.

Mr. Stevens: Eight billion.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Say \$8.5 billion to \$10 billion; two and a half times the total limit.

Mr. Stevens: The minister shrugs.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Yes. What's \$26 billion? It is only twice our present debt, that is all. Why is some of that money not available to Canadian industry to build ships for Canadians, designed by Canadians for use by Canadians and not built to put another flag on them? I find that I am absolutely incapable of understanding this aspect.

Mr. Stevens: The minister does not care.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I wonder if the minister is beginning to wonder why it is not a little different too. Maybe he never thought of it. It is about time he did. Unless we are to continue as hewers of wood and drawers of water and welders of plate, Canadian industry must have that sort of assistance for its shipbuilding industry.

I conclude with a final plea. Restraint must be practised if we enter this foreign market with these fantastic sums tucked in our back pockets. Please consider the need of our own industry, in the shipbuilding area particularly, which needs to

Export Development Act

build Canadian ships to carry Canadian goods designed by Canadian minds.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to speak on this matter today. However, as I listened to some speakers on the other side—not the last speaker because I must say I have a great deal of sympathy for him in his plea for the development of an indigenous merchant marine and for the development of our shipbuilding industry—I got the impression that if one came into the debate lately, although some of us have been discussing it in committee for some time, one would get the impression that it was some kind of a foreign aid scheme where we loaned money to countries all over the world for some vague purpose because we were fine people.

There is a strong reason for the existence of EDC. We loan money to foreign countries to buy goods made in Canada to create jobs in Canada. Do not buy any of this nonsense, as the hon. member from Winnipeg or the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) did, about this being a foreign aid scheme. Most hon. members on the other side know perfectly well that every country that is exporting and selling in foreign countries has some kind of an agency like the EDC. Japan has one, Germany has, the United States and so on.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): So has Cuba.

Mr. McRae: As a matter of fact the only countries that do not heavily subsidize, directly or indirectly, are the United States and Canada. Other countries subsidize these things very heavily. We cannot possibly sell goods abroad unless we get into this business.

The hon. member for St. John's West talks about his own province. What about the millions of dollars allocated to the Marystown shipyards so they could build tugs for Norway? This is an example of what has happened. I mention this particularly because in my community over the last four or five years we have had in excess of \$100 million worth of business through Hawker Siddeley in terms of rail cars to Mexico, and tree farms to Poland. This has created thousands and thousands of man-hours in our community and it is the same all over the country. I have not seen the figures for Winnipeg but I am sure there are many firms in Winnipeg that have created many jobs due to the fact that EDC arranged a loan with some foreign country. I get angry when members talk like this and say that this is some kind of a foreign aid scheme. It is not a foreign aid scheme, it is a scheme to support Canadian industry and Canadian workers. It creates thousands and thousands of jobs.

I have one last point I wish to make. I support the discussions hon. members have had, but one has to admit that these orders to the shipyards at least keep the shipyards going and therefore they should be supported in the same way as a rail car order, for instance, to Hawker-Siddeley in Thunder Bay tends to keep that company going between receiving local Canadian orders. It replaces its capital goods, etc. For these