Export and Import Permits

leader, in light of the undertaking given to the House by the Prime Minister today, when we can expect the very important piece of legislation dealing with excess profits?

Some hon. Members: Today!

Mr. MacEachen: The House will be given notice of the bill mentioned by the Prime Minister dealing with profits within a day or so, and we hope to proceed with it as quickly as possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

EXPORT AND IMPORT PERMITS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING EXPORT OF NATURAL RESOURCE PRODUCTS AND LIMITATION OF IMPORT OF FARM PRODUCTS

The House resumed from Tuesday, April 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andras that Bill C-4 to amend the Export and Import Permits Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening when I began to speak on the bill which is now before the House I said it was regrettable that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) had not seen fit to table the current 1973 report as required under the Export and Import Permits Act. I pointed out that previous reports have been tabled earlier in the year than this. This is certainly true of the last five years. I can be more explicit. In 1972 the report was tabled on March 3, in 1971 it was tabled on March 29, and in 1970 on February 12. In 1969, it was tabled on March 5 and in 1968 on February 18. These were all reports for the period ending December 31 in the year prior to their being tabled.

I draw attention to this shortcoming because I feel it demonstrates the haphazard, rather careless way in which the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is running his department. Presumably as a result of my comments last night, the report for 1973 has now been tabled. Here we are, late in April, with a report just tabled, while in all the years to which I have referred it was tabled well in advance of the present date. This item of legislation proposing amendments to the act has been on the order paper for some time now. Surely the least the House can expect is that the minister should provide the relevant reports under the act within a reasonable time after the end of the year.

The main comment I should like to make today is this. While we are in agreement with the principle of the legislation, we feel this is a measure which cannot be taken lightly. If the minister is correct in saying it is simply enabling legislation and that there is no immediate thought of utilizing the provisions we are being asked to put into the act, we can, of course, all be more relaxed. On the other hand, from what we hear from the other wing of [Mr.McGrath.] the government—for example, from the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent)—we suspect there may be much more in the amendments than most of us read into them.

This is what the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby said, as reported on page 1684 of yesterday's *Hansard*:

We are gradually inching our way toward some kind of resource management policy by means of amending an act which was originally passed to deal with trade in armaments.

He went on to say, as recorded on the same page:

What we need, and I want to assert this now, is an extension of the two-price system beyond these two commodities to a whole range of other commodities. I will list some of them before I suggest in a general way what the benefits will be from such a program for the people of Canada. I should like to suggest that a two-price system, one for export and one for import, be applied to energy resources—oil, natural gas, coal, uranium and hydroelectric power. In metals, it should include, copper, lead, zinc, gold and silver; in non-metallic minerals, gypsum, salt, asbestos, phosphates, and forest products, including lumber.

I suggest that the Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce or, preferably, the minister himself on his return, should rise in his place and declare unequivocally the government's purpose in introducing these amendments at the present time. Is it simply enabling legislation, as we have been told? Does the government have no immediate plans to impose export controls on any commodity, or is this bill being eased through the House in a relatively quiet way when in reality it is legislation introducing a two-price system in respect of commodities we produce?

This is an important issue and I think there ought to be extensive debate on it. As I say, there seems to be some conflict between what the official government spokesman tells us about the intent of this bill, and what the unofficial spokesman for the government says—that it is a bill introducing a two-price system into the country. These views should be reconciled and clarified. I say this because on reading section 3 of the act one understands the true import of what the amendment is doing. The section states:

• (1520)

The Governor in Council may establish a list of goods, to be called an Export Control List, including therein any article the export of which he deems it necessary to control for any of the following purposes, namely:

At the present time the only items that are cited are certain arms items. The act can also be used to implement an intergovernmental arrangement or commitment which is an understandable power for the government to want to retain. The government also say that the act may be used to ensure that there is an adequate supply and distribution of such articles in Canada for defence or other needs. That is the present section, and the amendment that is being proposed is that certain items may now be included in an export control list. These items are referred to in the amendments before us.

Section 3 of the Export and Import Permits Act is to be amended by adding the following:

(a.1) to ensure that any action taken to promote the further processing in Canada of a natural resource that is produced in Canada is not rendered ineffective by reason of the restricted exportation of that natural resource;