

Conservation of Natural Resources

preservation of game and fur-bearing animals and the increase thereof and that very adequate measures have been adopted, although in the beginning stages, in the development of Alberta fisheries and the protection thereof.

I am glad this debate has arisen. I wish that more positive and practical suggestions had been made by some of the speakers as to how the objectives they have in mind could be attained but, as I say, the debate was well worth while. We Social Crediters are heartily behind all wise measures for the development of the nation's resources and the conservation thereof.

Mr. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to deal very briefly with one or two points that came up during the discussion. The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) spoke of the fact that in the discussion that had taken place there had been no reference to any place east of Quebec. I would not wish to leave that on the record unchallenged. I did not attempt to go into the details of the tremendous iron possibilities across Canada. However, on many occasions I have made it clear that I am firmly convinced there are immense possibilities for the increased employment of our iron resources in every part of Canada. I hoped I had made it clear that I was not limiting my statement when I used the expression that a new iron ore empire has emerged right across Canada. I went further and spoke of the possibility of the greater use of our resources from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I mention that only for this reason, that I was not limiting my remarks in any way but stating a proposition which I believe applies to our iron ore resources right across the country.

I also wish to deal with one or two points made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe). I did not interrupt at the time he was speaking, but an interpretation was placed upon remarks I had made which I am sure those remarks did not support. He indicated that I had put forward a proposition that not a pound of iron ore should go to the United Kingdom. I said nothing of the kind. I said that the last pound of raw materials needed for the production of defence requirements should be assured. I did say that we should not encourage the export of a pound of iron ore that was not necessary for the defence purposes or that was not needed for the maintenance of continued production of essential requirements in another country. In fact I sought to make it clear that my position was the very contrary, and I believe these are the exact words I used. I said:

I hope that nothing I have said will be interpreted as an argument in favour of any dog-in-the-manger policy.

I had hoped my remarks from beginning to end indicated quite clearly that we should be prepared to accord those courtesies to the United Kingdom which we have received from them and also that we should co-operate with the United States in the great joint efforts we have made. I was directing my remarks particularly to the fact that we are expanding production of our raw materials at a tremendous rate, and I believe that in the increased production of these raw materials we should be directing our attention to the possibility of increasing the processing at advanced stages of all these raw materials for the greater employment of people in this country.

Referring to the subamendment moved by the leader of the C.C.F. party (Mr. Coldwell), I would simply like to make a brief observation to explain why I do not propose to support it. If it were simply a deletion of those words with no explanation and nothing to indicate what the purpose of the deletion is, I might not object to voting for the motion in the amended form. The hon. member has very properly explained what he does mean by the subamendment. He has indicated that in moving this deletion it is an expression of his own objection to the advantage of the free enterprise system in the development of these resources.

When he criticizes what has happened under the free enterprise system in the development of these resources, and indicates perhaps not too explicitly that he thinks they could be better developed and processed under another system, I would point out that the abuses he is referring to have been abuses from the failure of governments to adequately supervise the use of those resources. I have indicated, without directing my criticism to any particular government, that in the very nature of things in a country with such abundant resources there has been a tendency to take them for granted; and undoubtedly at the government level and other levels there have been methods employed which should not be approved.

On the other hand I do not think the record of governments in supervising the use of these resources in itself is a very good argument in favour of giving still greater authority to a government not only to supervise but to go apparently a step further and to engage in processing as well. It was for that very reason that this motion sought to make it clear in advocating the further processing, as well as the conservation of these resources, we believe it is under the free