

I listened with interest the other night to an hon. member saying that Brazil is making a tremendous breakthrough in resource development. Indeed it is, but I know enough about Brazil to know that the private sector in Brazil is not doing that on its own; it is certainly depending on the participation of the Brazilian government.

In Canada we have an economic system which has always been colonial in structure. It was designed to provide raw materials for manufacturing and finishing elsewhere. By and large that same phenomenon exists in Canada today.

Earlier today during question period I listened with interest when the government, in a sense, was proud of its arrangements with the province of British Columbia to extract coal from northeastern British Columbia to be sent away for processing into coke and used as a power source in the generation of finished products. It is the perpetuation of the old tradition—get it out of the ground, get rid of it as quickly as possible, hopefully get some half-decent return, and we are happy. It is the hewers of wood and drawers of water syndrome.

● (1730)

This begs the question: could we not as Canadians, with our iron ore and coal, the ability for coal liquefaction and a variety of other options, develop those coal beds in a more sophisticated and economic way, rather than simply digging it out and shipping it out as quickly as possible, and perhaps even paying more for it than we are asking the Japanese to pay?

There is a need for an industrial strategy. Some people will like it a bit more than others, but some people will abhor the idea of government participation in the economic system. Yet, it is a reality today in Canada and in virtually every other country. The best thing the Government of Canada could do today is bring into the House as quickly as possible a serious and sophisticated economic strategy which, once and for all, would be a dynamic document. Of course it would have to be a dynamic document because of changing times. It would point out to business, to industry and to individuals across the country a blue print of how we would like to see Canada develop within the next number of years; it would take advantage of our strengths.

We have immense and considerable strengths and advantages in the country. We have accessible and relatively inexpensive energy. This must be a crucial factor as we attempt to become competitive in a number of ways with the rest of the world. We have a well-educated and skilled populace and the ability to improve easily upon that.

We talk about some of the major resource projects being planned for western Canada. These projects ought to be occurring right now in western Canada, but they are not, for political reasons. We lack the appropriate skilled work force, but we have the system in place. We have the schools—the trade schools, vocational schools, technical schools and universities. If we had the will and commitment, we could provide skilled workers, scientists and artisans. This goes back to the

Borrowing Authority

research and development commitment, the commitment to move in that direction.

We have available capital. Capital does not flow easily into other countries of the world, but it does in Canada. People in all corners of the world know that Canada is a safe, stable and good place in which to invest money. We need a strategy to focus that capital into the most positive areas. We have the expertise, the wealth, the size and the resources.

We do not have something which many of the countries have, but it works to our advantage. Many other countries are hindered by old cultural, language, work, family and political traditions. They really hinder creative and innovative economic development. Canada is a youthful country. Most of us can trace back our families only 100, 200 or 300 years, compared to the people in many countries who can trace back their families thousands and thousands of years. We are fortunate that we are not hindered by these old traditions.

In closing, let me say, we have to oppose this particular bill because we do not have faith that the government knows what it is doing at this point. It does not have a blue print for the future, nor can it tell us with any assurance how it will spend that money in the best interests of Canadians. The opportunity is there. All we need is the will to do it. At this point in time we have difficulty supporting Bill C-59.

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to participate in this debate.

Mr. Knowles: Oh, what is this?

Mr. Pinard: I should like to say a few words on Bill C-59, to provide a supplementary borrowing authority. A tradition has developed over past years, and it seems that to succeed in approving such a bill at second reading stage the government has been required to give notice of limitation of debate under Standing Order 75c. This was also true with the former government in which my good friend, the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), was the government House leader. Even if I am a reformist by nature, sometimes I follow traditions.

We have already spent five days on second reading of this bill, and we will have to spend at least one more day. As I said previously—and I want to be consistent—with the heavy workload we are facing, it is impossible to allot more than five, six or seven days for this bill if we want to assume our responsibilities to the people of this country.

Therefore, I wish to inform the House that there have been consultations among the representatives of the parties and it has not been possible to reach an agreement under the provisions of Standing Order 75A or Standing Order 75B in respect of the proceedings at second reading stage of Bill C-59, to provide a supplementary borrowing authority. I wish to give notice that at the next sitting of the House I shall propose a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 75c, to allocate one additional sitting day for second reading stage of the said bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!