

but it was clearly ordained the day after that it was a mere personal boycott.

Have we successfully asserted our claims to fisheries management over the continental shelf? There are so many issues that cause thoughtful people great anxiety I am convinced that it is the mismanagement of things abroad which has been one of the large contributors to the ills of our economy at home. We are missing the boat in trade; we are withdrawing from those areas of world activity where we should be functioning at a high pitch with intensive involvement; we are failing to be vigorous in markets of the world and, as I documented a few minutes ago, we are losing markets which are precious and valuable to us. These are the kinds of things which must be considered not only in this debate, but which must be and will be considered by the Canadian people. It is that consideration and that kind of forecast of what conditions should be that is no doubt the reason we are still here and not out on the hustings testing the wind of public opinion on the economic mismanagement of this government.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North-Nipissing East): Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to participate in this debate at this particular point, following the speech we have just heard by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie). To start off my speech this afternoon, I should like to give him an example of the great economic savings and advantages which are the record of his present leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in this House of Commons. Let me quote from a report of a meeting of the Standing Committee of this House of Commons on National Resources and Public Works when the Atomic Energy of Canada officials appeared before it a couple of weeks ago. At that time the chairman asked the following question of Mr. Gray, President of Atomic Energy of Canada, Limited:

As you know, we are purchasing heavy water from as many areas in the world as we can. Can you give us the names of those countries and the costs that we are paying per pound for that heavy water at the present time? By comparison, what would heavy water cost us if we were in a position to produce enough to service ourselves as a nation?

To this question Mr. Gray replied:

We have bought a lot from the United States at varying prices starting at \$24 a pound, going to \$28 a pound, going to \$30 a pound, and they have just announced that the price is now \$39 a pound. We bought some from Sweden at \$31; we bought some from Russia at two prices, \$30 and I think the last was around \$32 a pound; and we bought some from Britain at \$30 a pound. We have leased some from Argentina at a 7 per cent charge, which we have to send back.

Had Glace Bay—

This is the plant which was originated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in this House when he was Premier of Nova Scotia. Quoting again:

Had Glace Bay produced heavy water, as it was supposed to do, we would be in a surplus position and would not have had to buy any of this expensive heavy water. This runs into quite a few millions because their contract price started at \$20.50 a pound and dropped down to \$16 a pound, for an average of \$18.15. That is the same number for the Canadian General Electric existing contract. At the moment we have been buying their production at \$20.50 a pound. So you can see that there is a big mark-up between \$20 and the new price of \$39. I suppose we have averaged \$30 a pound over all this production, which is something like 1,600 tons. We have

The Budget—Mr. Hopkins

paid at least \$10 more a pound, which comes to around \$30 million extra.

• (1700)

Is this the type of economy or the kind of economic measures the opposition in this House of Commons would offer to the Canadian people at a time when this government has the best record in many fields of any nation in the western world today?

Let us start looking at some of the positive things in life. We live in a nation which has the greatest potential. I believe the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Murphy) was correct when he asked whether, because with all the faults at our own doorstep, we ever compared our economy and problems with those of other nations in the world. I have asked this question in this House before, and I ask it again. Who would exchange his way of life in Canada today for that of a person in any other nation in the world? Let us stand up, be counted, and go ahead with a positive attitude for the development of this country. I say on behalf of all members of this House of Commons if some of the backbenchers in this House of Commons were listened to once in a while, those who have firsthand knowledge of their constituencies, and if their recommendations were taken to heart and proper measures followed, we would not have some of the problems which exist today at all levels of government.

I shall give a positive example of this. I do not pretend to be a prophet, but on October 22, 1970 in a speech in this House of Commons as recorded at page 475 of *Hansard* I stated the following:

I want to say a few words about transportation. It is my view that equitable freight rates and good roads are important in developing the Canadian economy, as are our very worth-while policies of regional economic expansion.

I wish to say at this stage that I am not a critic of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. I remember the days in 1962 when there were nearly 3,000 people in the unemployment rolls in the city of Pembroke at a time when members of the official opposition were in power. Not one single effort was made to alleviate the unemployment situation in that area at that time. I give the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) full marks for at least having the gumption and intestinal fortitude to stand up, be counted, and produce a program whether or not he may be criticized for the administration of it. It is only the doers in this world who are criticized and not the armchair critics.

In that same speech of October 22, 1970, I also stated:

We in the Ottawa valley have always been plagued with unsatisfactory road conditions. If there is one thing we badly need, it is a good highway artery.

Let me give the House a good example of what I mean. The bridge in the centre of the town of Petawawa that spans the Petawawa River was built before the first troops moved into Base Petawawa in 1907. Today, it is called upon to handle all the traffic moving into Base Petawawa from various parts of the country, as well as traffic destined for Chalk River. Invariably there is a big traffic jam right in the middle of the town of Petawawa during the rush hour, and it is nothing for cars to be lined up for three miles. One morning about two weeks ago the nuclear laboratories at Chalk River lost \$2,000 in wages which the Crown Corporation had to absorb because employees were late through no fault of their own. Renfrew County Council has brought this problem to the attention of the Minister of Highways of Ontario. It sent a