

earned through trade, and that figure would be much higher if we had our fair share of world trade.

In 1968, the year that the Trudeau Government took office, Canada's share of world trade was 5.74 per cent. By 1981, this figure had fallen to 3.8 per cent. I see that Your Honour is signalling that my allotted time is about to expire. I have just a couple more points that I would like to put across if I could have unanimous support of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Patterson):** The Hon. Member seeks unanimous consent. Is the House agreed?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Bradley:** Thank you so very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side for offering me this opportunity to carry on to make a couple of small points. I will try to bring it to a point—

**Mr. Dingwall:** Be nice.

**Mr. Bradley:**—and be nice to the Government, as I am being requested.

As I was saying, in 1968 Canada's share of world trade was 5.74 per cent. In 1981, the figure had fallen to 3.8 per cent. In 1968, Canadians exported more than the Japanese, yet today Japan's share of world trade is now twice that of Canada's.

The PC Party is dedicated to improving Canada's trade performance. It is not, however, dedicated to perpetuating the existing lack of accountability and control that characterizes the EDC and other Crown corporations. We will support the EDC if it becomes more accountable. We will support any corporation that assists us in export trade if it is more accountable. However, the track record is not that good. Including loan guarantees and other aid, Ottawa lost \$125 million as a consequence of its attempt to prop up Consolidated Computer during the 1970s. The Government's financial commitment to de Havilland to date totals \$751 million. The Government's financial commitment to Canadair to date totals \$1,836 million. In 1982, Canadair lost \$1.4 billion, the largest corporate loss in Canadian history. It even went down to a level where an Alaskan State Senator was sentenced to three years in jail for accepting and purchasing a bribe in relation to the potential purchase of a Canadair water bomber. However, the salesman was finally dismissed by Canadair, not for his alleged involvement in the bribe but, rather, because after four years as an employee of Canadair, he had not made a single sale.

● (1730)

We find that in February, 1981, CNR spent \$64,244 to purchase advertising space wishing the CPR, its chief competitor, a happy birthday. In 1977, the CBC spent \$2 million for radio and television stations valued at only \$800,000. In February of 1981, Petro-Canada purchased Petrofina for about \$1.46 billion, or \$120 a share. At the time of the purchase the shares were trading for \$90, or \$30 less per share than paid by Petro-Canada. In November, 1982, as revealed by the *Globe and Mail*, Petro-Canada paid rent for eight

### *Export Development Act*

months on a vacant 24-storey office building in Calgary. On the day that the Post Office became a Crown corporation, the Government helped employees celebrate by providing \$300,000 worth of free coffee, doughnuts and souvenir envelopes.

That is why we on this side are concerned about the accountability of Crown corporations. That is why we are moving these amendments to make the Export Development Corporation more responsible. We hope that our colleagues on the other side of the House and to our left will agree with us when we say that we must become more responsible in the House and that we must do it by starting now with Bill C-110.

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton):** Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I personally very much support the Export Development Corporation per se. It is obvious that Canadian businesses, particularly the small business sector, need assistance to export their products. Our market in Canada is sufficiently competitive to be able to compete in the world market. The Export Development Corporation, through Bill C-110 amending the Export Development Act, does not address itself to assisting the export of Canadian goods abroad. In fact, there are a number of examples which show how these amendments are detrimental to the Canadian business climate and Canada as a whole.

While my colleagues have been talking about the lack of accountability, which is probably the most important issue in this regard and which I will return to in a few moments, there are other issues as well. For example, the role of the private sector is too weak. As well, EDC is poorly managed.

Let me give a few examples of what the EDC has done in past years. For examples, the EDC has financed Inco developments in Indonesia and Guatemala, thus jeopardizing jobs in Sudbury and Manitoba. It has financed forest development projects in Mexico, Poland and Peru, developments that will compete with Canadian forest products. The EDC helped finance the construction of a monument to the Algerian revolution. Imagine that! At a time when Government borrowing costs were in the range of 16 per cent, the EDC arranged a 9.7 per cent loan of \$563 million U.S., which is approximately \$700 million Canadian, to assist Bombardier in the sales of subway cars to New York city. Forty per cent of jobs created by this deal are in the United States and not in Canada. The list of bad deals by the EDC goes on. It is unbelievable that there will not be a decrease of the bureaucratic involvement in running the EDC.

By now all Canadians must surely know that the more bureaucrats involved in a business venture, Crown corporation or any form of agency or business, the worse that organization will operate. One need look no further than Canada Post to see that it is not very profitable, being an organization run by bureaucrats and the Government. While the list goes on, I have only ten minutes and I must move on to other areas.

One difficulty is the fact that the private sector is not involved. Let me quote the following passage from the Economic Council of Canada from its report entitled "Intervention and Efficiency":