

*Policy Statement on National Resources*

been taken in several provinces in Canada to co-ordinate a comprehensive federal and provincial plan in order to develop resources, both natural and human, in these specific areas.

I also pointed out to the house that this contrasted with the shotgun or machine gun approach of the previous administration. I mentioned the fact that opposition speakers had made such sweeping generalizations as really to weaken their own arguments. Perhaps they would have been well advised to recognize the fact—and fact it is—that in a number of important areas the federal government has taken several important and broad initiatives.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there may perhaps be room for constructive criticism that would be helpful to parliament and to the country, but it would seem that the tactics of the official opposition have not really changed very much from what they had been in earlier parliaments. This I suggest affects seriously the credibility of the arguments advanced by hon. members opposite.

I would also point out in passing one oversight—as I am sure it was—in the speech of the former minister of agriculture, who was criticizing the government for 22 cent power, I believe it was. I would draw to his attention that the administration of which he was a member sold power at the border for 24 cents. Although this was at a considerably later date in time from the 22 cent contract, I do not think that this action when he was a minister in that administration is at all in keeping with some of the things he would like us to believe as a result of the speech that he made in this house.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), in his usual style of oversimplification, also suggested that there was a dilemma, or something of that sort, over the type of policy that we should adopt in this country. On the one hand the leader of the New Democratic party suggested there is such a thing as a continentalist approach, while on the other hand he suggested there was a nationalist approach.

I hope that for the sake of this country and of this parliament there is a third approach, one not so ideologically hidebound or restrictive as that adopted by the leader of the New Democratic party. I should like to think that as Canadians we can take a pragmatic approach to the development of our resources and not be concerned about any taboos when it comes to dealing with other countries.

[Mr. Cashin.]

I have a tremendous fear that if the kind of thinking which is exemplified by the leader of the New Democratic party were to become widespread in this country we would in fact return to an isolationist position which I suggest is not in keeping in this modern world. I also indicate, with all due respect, an inaccuracy in the speech of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. He said that power was being sold in Seattle at 22 cents. That is not correct; it is being sold in Seattle at 35 cents.

I also made reference before the supper hour to policies and programs of the government as far as fisheries are concerned. I draw attention to the fact that today in Ottawa a very important conference is being held which can have far-reaching effects on the development of our fisheries resource and the maximum utilization of that resource. The fish protein conference is being held this week in Ottawa, and this protein is commonly known as fish flour. Tonight in the Confederation room a number of members of parliament had an opportunity to taste food prepared with fish flour, and I think most came away with the impression that the development of fish flour has great potential.

As one who knows, like my hon. friend from Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Stewart), I am sure that great progress will ultimately be made in the development of this protein for world consumption and that great benefit will accrue to the fishermen of eastern Canada largely as the result of the initiative taken by this government. However, I want my friends from western Canada to rest assured that world demand for flour will be such that they will be able to maintain their traditional markets. I think that the conference now being held, which is one step in a series of initiatives taken by this government in developing a fisheries policy, is another example of how absurd were some of the comments which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The hon. gentleman from Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) seems to have quite a gift for making the rather ridiculous and absurd seem plausible. While I envy him this gift, and while indeed at times by his mere demeanour in the house he may be able to convince us that he is speaking from Mount Sinai, anybody who takes the trouble to examine the facts will surely realize that in the field of fisheries resources—in fact, in the whole resource field—this government has