

experienced an increasingly worsening balance of payments position relating to travel. In 1964 our balance on travel was in deficit to the extent of \$50 million; more went out than came in. In 1966 the deficit was \$60 million. In 1968 the deficit decreased to \$30 million largely because the previous year, centennial year, had generated a positive inflow of \$423 million. In 1970 our deficit with respect to the balance of travel payments was \$226 million. In 1971 it was \$201 million, slightly less than in 1970 but showing the same general trend. So we have gone downhill very badly in our balance of payments in travel.

Quite a bit of money is involved. After all, we are dealing with foreign funds here. Our travel balance in the first and fourth quarters of the year has been increasingly adverse. There has been a combination of failures. We have failed to promote our greatest asset, winter sports, and more Canadians have travelled abroad. The figures show that we are moving backward with respect to travel. It is obvious that we need policies which are designed to promote tourism, as proposed in the Speech from the Throne. It is equally obvious, Mr. Speaker, that those policies have not been forthcoming.

The government, in the present session or indeed in any further session of this Parliament if there should be one, will hardly find it possible to support and improve one of our best producers of foreign currency. I think it is tragic that this area has been so completely neglected. I have picked one of many. It is unfortunate that no bill in this area has come forward since this session began.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the motion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) is worded as follows:

This House regrets the failure of the government to proceed during the current session of Parliament with a positive legislative program;—

There is a charge which is not truly founded and if the Leader of the Opposition were a lawyer and if the plea which he made this afternoon were made in court, the judge would not hesitate to dismiss the case.

The remarks made previously by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) demonstrate how groundless the motion of the Leader of the Opposition is.

I have listened, carefully of course, to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I am not at all surprised that he should try to minimize the extremely important effects of the government's legislation. But what makes me particularly sad and disappointed is that in the course of his speech he failed to suggest any new solution to the current problems in Canada.

**Mr. Béchard:** He has none.

**Mr. Ouellet:** All he can do is repeat and I would say that his words are a true reflection of his party. It is a real indication of the weaknesses of the Progressive Conservative Party which is old-fashioned, worn and exhausted. I think that the best parts of his speech were those where he repeated the comments of the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans). I find it quite sad to see that the Leader

#### *Procedure of Legislative Program*

of the Opposition has to take his views from government members when he wants to be interesting.

• (1720)

I would also like to point out some comments previously made by the Leader of the Social Credit party of Canada, the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). When he begins to speak, everything is fine, but it always turns for the worse. Indeed, he can never refrain from exaggerating, railing against the government and saying half truths.

The leader of the Social Credit was talking through his hat today when he blamed the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) for going to China. It is true that the minister did so and he may even go back. However, it is wrong to suggest, as the leader of Social Credit did, that the minister is going to China to promote imports of Chinese textile products in Canada. He should have wanted to say—and this is what he should have said—that he goes over there to sell our products to the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, we know the importance of a dynamic foreign trade for our country. The population of Canada being small, we must export large quantities of goods to maintain our standard of living. This government went to great efforts in order to increase our exports, and they increased, during the last six years, from \$8 billion to \$18 billion. This is what the government is doing, and what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is also doing when he goes to China; he tries to sell our products. And this is not at all the same thing as what the hon. member for Témiscamingue claims.

To return to the motion before us today, I will remind you that Speech from the Throne of February 17, 1972, was excellent. Its purposes were the following: the government will introduce bills concerning the continuing development of our natural resources, the means of giving more generous help to those among us who are in need, the involvement of a great number of Canadians into community activities which are rewarding, the preservation of our natural heritage, the strengthening of our national identity and of our own image.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree with the second part of the motion of the Leader of the Opposition where he bewails the government's inability to carry out the program outlined in the Speech from the Throne of February 17, 1972. Let us examine together the motions and bills studied and passed by Parliament. Due to the time limit, I will only mention a few.

Since the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) is present, I would like to say a few words on the bill concerning national parks. Thanks to the leadership of this minister, there are now national parks in all ten provinces of Canada. I take this opportunity to congratulate him on the establishment of national parks in the province of Quebec. This has been awaited for a long time, and we should be delighted with the new legislation opening the gates.

I want to say a few words about the bills covering amendments to the Canadian Labour code, to the National Housing Act, to family income security and finally to foreign ownership control.