

Borrowing Authority Act

or political strategies to deal with this fact. We are not alone in the industrial world in having a difficult time dealing with multinational corporations and the effects huge private interests have on the public. Many other countries are in the same position, but no modern industrial country has done as little as Canada has done to deal with those effects. It is precisely because I am proud to be a Canadian and do not need to take lessons in patriotism from members of the Liberal party that I am ashamed of the performance of this government.

I see some Conservative hon. members to my right nodding. All I can say is that their policies would make matters even worse. If we increase reliance on foreign investment in this country, we will simply be digging a deeper hole. We are in a hole because we have a resource economy which is completely reliant on foreign investment for its survival, and unless we build up a secondary manufacturing sector which would allow Canada to take its place in the industrial world, we will simply go from pillar to post as other countries carry on their protectionist policies.

Canada is the only country in the world which is talking naively about free trade, as if this was the nineteenth century. This is not the nineteenth century. If we indiscriminately lower tariff barriers, the effect will be to destroy Canadian industry. Hon. members will be surprised to know that one of the first appeals to come to me as a member of parliament was from a company which has a factory in my riding. That company was concerned about the policies of the government with respect to fiscal and foreign investment problems and the effect those policies would have on it. That company was not talking about a free market. The president of that company, for all I know, might go home and talk privately about the fact that people on welfare are getting too much money, that some people are not working and that the government should not get involved in the economy, but I want to point out that when his company is in trouble, he knows where to turn because he knows the kind of economy he is living in and the problems with which he has to deal.

The government opposite has no industrial strategy. Hon. members to my right would make it even more difficult for the government to initiate such a strategy, and over the weeks and months ahead I look forward to the possibility of speaking in debates in which we will be able to make our proposals and options even clearer. We would be left with Hobson's choice, a choice between even more policies which would do nothing to solve the economic problems we have and the continued maladministration, incompetence and indifference of the government opposite, except that I am proud to say that I am doing everything I can as a member of the New Democratic Party to see that the Canadian people are not stuck with that choice.

There is a third possibility which provides for a recognition of the fact that we need to provide decent incomes for our people, that we need to redistribute income in favour of the poor and not in favour of those who have property, that we need to provide full employment in our economy, that we need to provide industrial jobs for our people, that we should not be

[Mr. Rae.]

solely dependent on a resource economy for the future and that 3,000 miners in Sudbury should not be told by an energy minister that they can always pack up and move 500 or 1,000 miles to another job. That may be very well for the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Gillespie) to say, but I suspect that in six or eight months he will be packing up and moving 600 or 800 miles to another job.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has no right to give that message to people who have families, homes and commitments in the city in which they have made their homes. The Liberals and Conservatives would treat people as commodities, move them around as the market dictates, and would have towns and resources in certain areas of the country dry up and die because some large industrial firm somewhere decides to make a greater profit in Guatemala, Gabon or some other place.

The New Democratic Party is saying that that is not the only option for the Canadian people. It is possible for working people, through their institutions, parties and governments, to express the confidence they have in themselves by saying that they come first, that they come before profits and that they come before the interests of private enterprise. That is the message we will be taking to the Canadian people, and there is no doubt in my mind that when that message is sent clearly and cogently, the Canadian people will listen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to speak today about what is probably one of the most ill-conceived pieces of government legislation brought before this House in the last decade.

I listened to an excellent speech last evening given by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Parker), a reasonable proposal put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) today, and, of course, the speech given by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Rae), who put forward the socialist message, much as if the campaign had not stopped on October 16.

Mr. Broadbent: It is just starting, brother.

Mr. Dick: Indeed the campaign may not have stopped for the hon. member for Broadview because he squeaked in by only about 400 votes. When he was castigating the Liberals for talking out of both sides of their mouths, I suppose he had some difficulty because he does not know whether to set his sights on the Liberals or the Conservatives. I can only presume he spent so much time on the Conservatives because he fears them most.

Bill C-7 epitomizes what has been going on over the last number of years. Through stealth, deception, falsehood and other fraudulent means the government has been trying to mislead Canadians into believing that it really does care about Canada. This government does not care about the people of Canada; it is concerned only about preserving the power it has.

I would like to put these comments into a certain perspective. We remember when the Liberal party changed the date