

that no suggestions have been made is the height of ludicrousness.

The minister also suggested that some of us seemed to be hung up on the point that grants are being made only to large and to foreign-owned companies, that that seemed to be our only concern and we are suggesting this is the only thing his department does. The minister cannot deny that in statement after statement, and in its own publications, his department has made it clear that the industrial incentives program is its number one program. He cannot deny that a significant percentage of grants given under this program is to large companies, for large amounts. That is a matter of record. Neither can he deny that a large percentage of the grants have gone to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies. Those are matters of fact, not matters for argument at all.

The minister then dealt with some of the examples given by the hon. member for York South in relation to the old question of transplanting unemployment. He dealt with a number of cases, such as the closing down of the pulp mill at Timiskaming and the grant for the ITT plant in another location in Quebec. He then suggested that we were saying that the Timiskaming plant was closed as a result of the grant which had been given to the other company. However the minister might wish to interpret the words of the hon. member for York South and others, he cannot escape the fact that a conflict is involved in the closing of one plant at one location and simply giving a grant to a company to open another plant at another location.

The minister also missed a very fundamental point made in one of the seven points put forward by the hon. member for York South, namely, that in dealing with the issues we must look at more than just the profit and loss position of a company. We must look at the question of community interest, a fundamental question of great importance.

The minister also suggested that one of the reasons the Timiskaming plant was closed was higher transportation cost. Why does the minister take note of that point? The fact is that if he and the government had taken steps to equalize transportation rates across Canada, they could do more to eliminate regional disparity than all the departmental programs initiated to date could do.

The minister then went on to deal with Duplate and Michelin and said that under the old legislation he had no discretion in their case. I acknowledge the minister's point in that regard, but at the same time he showed willingness and readiness to accept the phony arguments put forward by those companies for closing down their operations at other locations. Then later on he pointed out that Union Carbide had said they were going to leave the country.

It seems to me that no example could underline better the seriousness of the crisis facing Canada on this issue of foreign ownership. Where is the government's policy on foreign ownership? I can argue about some of the things said by the minister in relation to the program, but if he wants to eliminate some of the problems that he feels exist, why does his government not come forward with its policy on foreign ownership? Why does he not come forward with a meaningful policy which would result in a change of direction for Canada?

Regional Development

• (1540)

We could argue about some of the various firms and the particulars concerning them, but I think none of us has adequate information on the subject at this point. I think it is incumbent upon the government to table all the documents concerning these specific examples. I challenge the government to table the documents in respect of the grants made to these companies and the whole situation concerning the shutdown of these plants. These documents should be referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development. In this way we could perhaps answer some of the questions which many people are asking.

I also notice that the minister made no reference to the Industrial Incentives Advisory Board. He might recall that when the hon. member for York South spoke he referred to the problem involving the Industrial Incentives Advisory Board and the potential conflict of interest there. Why does the minister not take steps to correct this situation? When we make a suggestion that the minister should hew away such a conflict of interest we are attempting to help his programs, but he does not accept our help; he apparently thinks he knows it all. The fact is that at the present time there is a potential conflict of interest in respect of this board. I want to make clear that I am not necessarily casting any aspersion on the individuals involved; however, there is a potential conflict of interest which unless resolved and corrected is a situation with which no person can satisfactorily deal. We have Mr. J. B. Estey, executive vice-president of National Sea Products—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Weatherhead: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the hon. member would accept a question.

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly a point of order. I should bring to the attention of hon. members that we could very well run into difficulty in respect of allocation of time. Perhaps we should have decided to have 15-minute instead of 20-minute speeches. There is a long list of speakers from different parts of the House. Hon. members might give thought to reducing the number of points of order and reducing the length of speeches so that more of their colleagues might have an opportunity to participate in the debate. The hon. member may, of course, accept the question, but that would be on his own time.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude my remarks. I shall be happy to answer a question at the end of my speech if there is time left, which I cannot guarantee at this moment.

We have these various officials. I mentioned one, Mr. J. B. Estey, executive vice-president of National Sea Products. This company received three grants totalling over \$2.2 million for expansion of fish processing plants in St. John's Newfoundland, Halifax and Louisbourg, N.S. Then there is Mr. E. Kendall Cork, vice-president and treasurer of Noranda Mines. Noranda Mines received a grant of \$3½ million. Then there was a grant of \$1,155,500 to Gaspé Copper Mines, a fully-owned subsidiary of Noranda