

guidance of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Pure buttering up.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Some of them, I certainly would not have approved.

Mr. Cullen: I regret that this motion has been brought forward. I can see it having harmful effects on Polymer Corporation at a time when it is once again coming into its own as a result of new ideas and the injection of new capital following its purchases by CDC. If this motion or any other tactic adopted by the Official Opposition has the result of destroying the business effectiveness of Polymer, its employees will not have to look beyond the Conservative Party for the culprit.

I said that this motion came a little late in the day. Appropriately enough, during the last election campaign, the New Democratic party and its candidate in my constituency did challenge the sale of the corporation on two grounds. First, because the sale price was too low and, second, because in the final analysis it would not be the average Canadian who would purchase shares in the Canada Development Corporation, and thus, in the long run the Canadian taxpayer would lose the advantage of profits created by the corporation. These two issues were debated at the right time and in the right place. The address today by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) clearly showed that an appropriate and just purchase price was paid. As to the second argument, it would really be up to the Canadian public to decide whether they derive advantage from the work of the Canada Development Corporation. There are millions of dollars lying about in this country in savings banks and other places which could be invested in Canada. The Canada Development Corporation will provide this opportunity.

It is my hope that the Canadian public will answer the challenge to invest in Canada and that stocks and shares will be purchased by many more Canadians than would have received a dividend on profits from the Polymer Corporation. I understand there are about eight million taxpayers in Canada, and that if Polymer Corporation turned over \$8 million to the federal government, each taxpayer would benefit to the extent of \$1. I suggest it is well within the investment capacity of Canadians to derive substantially more from investment in the Canada Development Corporation, and I am satisfied that future developments will bear this out if Canadians invest in Canada.

• (1730)

I hope I did not hear the hon. member for Peace River correctly when I thought he said in answer to an interjection, that if his party formed the government they would set aside the sale. I hope that is not right. Surely they have done enough damage to date without making statements such as that. When we are talking about Polymer, we are not only talking about a corporation; we are talking about people. That is why I hope that if the Tories form the government, they will not make good this threat, because they will be attacking innocent people working for the corporation. If they followed such a suggestion, or that of

Sale of Polymer

the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), I suggest it would hurt the employees of Polymer.

In speeches from the Official Opposition we have not yet heard anything in opposition to the sale of Polymer Corporation. The speeches have represented an attack on the NDP and the position it takes. I say to members of the NDP that if they vote in favour of this motion they will be in fact voting against the man working at Polymer Corporation in the city of Sarnia.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have known the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) for a considerable time and thought he had a great deal more ability and, I am sorry to say, integrity than displayed in his speech this afternoon. His speech distorts the whole matter we are debating this afternoon. He has alleged that this is an attack on Polymer as such and an attack on the workers of that corporation. If the hon. member persists in that line I will say that it is a public lie, because there is nothing in this motion or in this debate—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):—that touches upon the structure of Polymer in any way. There is nothing in this motion that will reduce its capitalization; there is nothing that will change the effectiveness of its marketing organization; there is nothing that will effect its marketing function. And the motion was not designed for that purpose. Because of a paucity of ideas, the hon. member, in trying to reply to this motion, has raised this spectre, this red herring. I repeat, it is a public lie that this is an attack on Polymer or the people of Sarnia.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair does not wish to become involved in the debate, but I wonder if the hon. member is not going a little far. Perhaps there is a way for him to qualify his statement. Hon. members cannot accuse other members of wilfully lying to this House. I just want to warn the hon. member not to go too far in that direction.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at your sensitivity in respect of these words. I used the words "public lie"; I did not say the hon. member was lying to this House. If he persists in that argument, then it is a public lie. I am well aware of the rules in respect of calling an hon. member a liar, and I know the hon. member too well for that. But this argument as put forward is a public lie. I have no doubt that the hon. member wants to show himself as the great champion of the people of Sarnia. That is perfectly all right, and he can engage in all kinds of parish pump politics—and I say he was engaging in parish pump politics in his speech this afternoon—but it is not a fact that this motion is an attack upon Polymer.

Vote 16b is being debated on the basis of the rules. This is an opposition day on which we can discuss the estimates.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!