

Supply—Trade and Commerce

That matter was mentioned, but it was not discussed in any detail. It will certainly be considered by the attorneys general and the Minister of Justice.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 30, I asked the Minister of Justice whether this matter would be on the agenda of the then pending conference of the minister with the attorneys general of the provinces. My question is found at page 8609 of *Hansard* for that date. It was a bit lengthy and I do not need to read it, but it was the same question; would the matter of Canada taking a final stand herself be discussed at the then pending conference. The minister's reply was also lengthy. He went into certain details, but he concluded with these sentences:

But I must say I am very ready to consider the matter and to raise the point at the conference as it has been raised by my hon. friend. This once more goes to show how useful these discussions are.

Twice by the Prime Minister and once by the Minister of Justice the house was given the assurance that this matter would be discussed at these conferences. Yesterday, as recorded at page 9073 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Justice whether the matter had been discussed. The operative portion of his answer reads as follows:

No, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest that if the government had no intention of raising this matter at the recent conferences it could have told the house so, but what has happened is that the house was told on three occasions that it would be done. Yesterday we learned that it was not done. My point of privilege is surely quite clear. Parliament deserves better than this at the hands of the government.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

1. Departmental administration including fees for membership in the international organizations listed in the details of the estimates, \$5,180,500.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Mr. Chairman, last evening at ten o'clock I was discussing a few unfair facets of the department's administration in their application to the national economy. About ten years ago a Liberal administration gave permission to the Del Monte company of California, a large food processing company in the United States, to buy out Canadian Canners, close down some canneries and thus cut off a large economic market for Canadian farmers. I mentioned this matter last

night with particular reference to the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox, where many factories were closed down.

I also discussed the vast outflow of union dues to the United States. These matters seem to complement one another, the closing up of Canadian industries by U.S. financial interests and the multimillion dollar flow of union dues from Canadian industry to the United States. The minister mentioned the progress made by Canadian industry, but in doing so I think his eyesight was in reverse. What a wonderful thing it would be for Canada if we could rid ourselves of United States industrial colonialism.

I am not against unions and I realize their necessity to collect dues for their funds, but I submit the unions should be strictly Canadian in nature, investing their money at home and drawing interest on it in Canada. Once their funds pass beyond our boundaries they are nothing but a detriment to our country. Only a very small proportion is returned to Canada in the form of payments made to union employees whenever they are on strike, and I would remind members of the committee that strikes per capita are less frequent in Canada than they are in the great republic to the south of us.

How long will we have to put up with this economic system of industrial colonialism? Lately we have heard a lot about repatriating our constitution. I say let us repatriate those millions of dollars which are going out of the country in the form of union dues, and which are a detriment to our economy because they represent a good share of our adverse trade relationship with the United States.

One of the main causes of the high cost of living is the taxation of business and industry. Increased taxation of industry by the government is an impediment to the export of our manufactured products to other countries, especially to those countries which have a more frugal and less luxurious standard of living than we enjoy. I pause here to congratulate Canada in this regard. We certainly have a very high standard of living here compared with the other countries with which we trade and with which we enjoy a preponderance of trade in our favour.

Does Canada know just what the end cost of high living will be? Will the Canadian people allow their government to tax them into oblivion, to tax them and their industry into a state where they sit among their luxury items of high living beside silent machines