

Interim Supply

farm implement industry owned in this case as a co-operative measure by the people of Canada and by the farmer-consumers involved. We had a farm implement inquiry. Some of us have made certain recommendations; but we suggest that, until the federal government takes an active role, farm implement prices will continue to rise.

The Prime Minister has been a great advocate of Canadianism. When he advocates Canadianism, I think it has a particular appeal to the people of this country. In order to bring about a measure of Canadianism I suggest it is time that, as a national policy, we embarked upon a program of developing this country in the interests of Canadians. I believe steps should be taken to remove this huge trade deficit with the United States, which means in fact that in exchange for imports of many millions a year Canada is steadily selling larger and larger chunks of her natural resources and her industries to investors from that country. Instead of Canada following a course of development more and more in the ownership and control of Canadians, we are going the other way; we are going backwards. Fifty-one per cent of the manufacturing industry of this country is controlled from outside our country; 75 per cent of the petroleum industry is owned outside our country; 97 per cent of the automobile industry; 98 per cent of the rubber goods industry.

We say it is time we embarked upon a policy of public development and of a repatriation of these industries to Canadians. We suggest that we shall never have complete and full independence in international policies; we shall never have the full respect of other nations in international affairs until we can demonstrate that we have embarked upon a policy under which our country is developed in the interests of Canadians and is not following a course in which a larger and larger part of this nation is owned and controlled from outside. Surely no one will argue that a country as wealthy as ours should be able to produce the kind of investment capital needed to put people to work, to provide ownership of Canadian industry.

Mr. Chairman, this government, by the very fact that this session is the longest in the history of this country, has proven itself inept. In my opinion the government is at an all-time low since the last election as far as support in Canada is concerned. We suggest that the people of this country need to be offered a real choice; a choice between mismanagement, free enterprise as defined by the government, and a program of public

[Mr. Argue.]

development and public expansion based upon democratic institutions and on control by the Canadian people.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Will he not agree that the speech he has just made is a much abler speech than anything that could be done in that line by Mr. Thomas Douglas?

Mr. Argue: Mr. Chairman, I would welcome the opportunity in any part of the country to allow the public of this country to make their own choice, in answer to the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, before the—

An hon. Member: Are you a candidate too?

Mr. Howard: I may be a candidate in a short while, depending upon when the "sooner or later" arrives.

An hon. Member: It will be later.

Mr. Howard: The hon. member for Assiniboia referred to the statement of the Prime Minister some months ago that the next election, whenever it does come, would be fought on the basis of private enterprise versus democratic socialism. I do not think that was what the Prime Minister really meant. I think he has had misgivings about that statement concerning the basis of an election campaign. Just the other day the Prime Minister said an election would be fought on the basis on Senate reform, and I understand he has now changed his mind about that and is searching for some other basis upon which to fight an election.

Mr. Speakman: From where do you get your information?

Mr. Howard: In raising this question of private enterprise and the detrimental effects of private enterprise upon the average citizen and upon the Canadian consumer I should like to deal with the aspect of it within which the drug industry, or the pharmaceutical industry, falls. I dealt with this subject on another occasion. I did not have the opportunity to go into it fully at that time because in the estimates of the Department of Justice the objection of the Minister of Justice to discussing a certain type of report was upheld. But this is now public property.

I think we must consider the drug industry as being entirely different from any other type of industry because the consumer relationship with the industry is not the same. We find that in fact what these free enterprisers on the other side of the house attach themselves to does not exist within the