

warehouses as well as the other various aspects of a highly productive region of Canada.

I think it is worth pointing out to members of the House the tremendous change that has taken place in such a relatively short period of time. In my memory, which certainly does not go back too far, I recall when Canada was nothing but an exporter of primary products, as well as of some tractors and a few other relatively minor manufactured goods. The change that has taken place over that 25 or 30 year period is, I believe, a tremendous achievement in the area from which I come.

I think those of us who come from Metro when we talk about the establishment of new industries are somewhat less enthusiastic about it than we are about the establishment of industries in other parts of Canada where jobs are crucial because of the tremendously high unemployment. Those of us from the metropolitan Toronto area are certainly less interested in 1976 than we would have been in 1947. I find it difficult to understand that the government's policies—and of course this goes back to the postwar area—have been so bad when we can have a member from British Columbia complaining about the problems of entrepreneurs in British Columbia, especially when we consider that the concept of entrepreneurs in his area 30 years ago would have been quite unusual.

If we talk about trade I do not see how we can exclude ourselves from the rest of the industrialised world. I think we would be remiss in forgetting that since 1970 the world has been in a state of economic chaos. We should remember that the energy component of every manufactured item and every item that affects our lives has increased eight times since 1970.

A barrel of Arabian light crude, which I think is what is used in the oil business as the base price, in 1970 was priced at something in the area of \$1.50 a barrel, while today it is \$11.50 a barrel. I should like to point out to members that the cost of producing that barrel of oil is 17 cents, while the cost to have it piped into a tanker in the Arabian Gulf, or wherever most of it comes from, I believe is 27 cents. I do not understand how one can talk about international trade and the terrific disruptions which have occurred in international trade without taking this crucial fact into consideration.

It is clear that this eight-fold increase brought about by mostly non-industrialised countries is the most significant factor since the industrial revolution began in 1770. This is the first time the industrialised countries in fact have not had the power to force their views on a non-industrialised part of the world. This surely has affected Canadian trade patterns in respect of manufactured goods, as it has affected the trade patterns of our trading partners.

I should like to point out to hon. members that when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made his important trip to Mexico, Cuba, and Venezuela, a lot of attention was given by members opposite to his stop in Cuba. I have not heard a great deal about the visit he made to Venezuela. I think it is important that we have the facts straight. The fact is that 7 per cent of all Venezuelan exports comes to Canada and involves mainly oil. The amount of our exports going to Venezuela is so small that it could hardly be measured on a scale.

The Prime Minister went to Venezuela to assist in that situation, but members opposite are far more interested in making rather ludicrous comments about his stop in Cuba

Productivity and Trade

because, to them, that sounds better. They really are not interested in the attempt of the Prime Minister to encourage Canadian industry and Canadian trade with countries like Venezuela with which traditionally we have not done too much export manufacturing business. I know that hon. members opposite are far more interested in the fact that he stopped in Havana, but they have no interest in the real value of the visit which took place when the Prime Minister continued on to Venezuela.

● (2150)

I should like to point out that we have had this disruption in trade since 1970, and it has been a world-wide phenomenon. I think it is worth pointing out some of the possibilities that some hon. members opposite may be promoting. One of them is that possibly we should cut back on Canadian tourists going abroad; that would have a significant effect on our balance of payments and our trade picture.

For the information of hon. members, Canadians have a wealthy society. I think it could be said that we have the wealthiest society in the world, if tourism is any indication. Canada is the largest tourist market in the world. Canadians spend more money abroad than any other people on earth, which is an indication that Canadians have money to spend and that they have jobs. Many of those jobs are in the manufacturing sector, about which hon. members opposite seem to be so concerned. I do not think it would be a positive step to start restricting the money which Canadians spend abroad. It is good for Canadians to get around, learn things, and benefit from all the other side effects which are associated with the fact that they have become such great world travellers over the past 15 or 20 years.

I should like also to point out that I have never pretended to be an expert on world trade, but I think the credit we extended to the Soviet Union last year was a positive step in selling Canadian goods. The credit to Indonesia which was announced yesterday by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Jamieson) was a positive step toward selling Canadian goods. I do not have the list in front of me of countries to which we have extended credit, but I know that it is a substantial one. It is also worth pointing out the contractual link with the European Economic Community. The fact is that we have taken this kind of step to break away from our close arrangement with the United States and our dependency on one market. To try to extend that market into the European community is a good move. I think it is a positive step which is being taken by the Government of Canada.

As one who drives around to factories and manufacturing areas I cannot help but be impressed, not by the low productivity and the small amount of emphasis which has been put on the export of manufactured goods, but on the contrary, by the fact that on balance our productivity is good. We have made terrific efforts—and they have been successful efforts, as the last 20 years show—to sell our manufactured goods overseas.

Mr. Frank Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, the two main points in the motion before us tonight which was moved by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) are the alarming trade figures and