

Council office would be denied \$18.6 million to pay for the last election so that there could be a new election.

Mr. Speaker, we condemned the sale of Polymer last year, we condemned it yesterday, and we condemn it today.

An hon. Member: But you are going to vote for it tonight.

Mr. Rodriguez: These Tories are opposed to the investment of public funds to develop Canada's resources for the benefit of all Canadians. Like their Liberal counterparts, they are friends of the corporate elite and masters of the game of exploitation. As a matter of fact, Tories are experts in exploitation. They have one, Mr. Stephen Roman, owner of Denison Mines—this is what shakes my confidence that they can ever lead the country in terms of what we want—who in a speech to the Kiwanis Club in Toronto, at the Royal York hotel on January 13, 1971, said: "From time immemorial we have had exploiters and exploited." Mr. Speaker, this gentleman owns Denison Mines which paid no income tax between the years 1961 and 1970, despite profits of \$63.5 million from 1965 to 1970.

In addition, Denison entered into an agreement with the federal government in December, 1970, by which the federal government agreed to subsidize the company to the tune of \$29.5 million, three-quarters of the cost of stockpiling uranium concentrate. This man, who knows exploitation inside out, went on to say that: "exploiters were feudal lords, industrial barons or modern politicians." I guess he meant Tory politicians. He said: "In our capitalistic society the proper approach of capital to the end result will not lead to the exploitation of the human being." Who is he trying to kid with that?

An hon. Member: The voters.

Mr. Rodriguez: Well, he was not successful. He went on to say: "Compulsory exploitation of the creative elements of our society by an element unwilling to work creates and produces no less than the nineteenth century exploitation of the poor by capital." He believed: "Every human being needs a certain amount of anxiety to stimulate creativity, and if we do away with anxiety we will produce a human being devoid of emotion and initiative." It is passing strange that the removal of such an anxiety by government subsidy to Denison did not rob Mr. Roman of his ambition. Why did the government not at least get equity for the subsidies the taxpayers gave to Denison? Where were the Tories then? But to get back to the CDC—

An hon. Member: How about Polymer? That's what the debate is about.

Mr. Rodriguez: Obviously, in spite of the power games that they play in this House of Commons, and I wish they could be televised so that the people of Canada could see what happens here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rodriguez: I wish the television cameras could see this performance.

An hon. Member: You would come out a real pinko.

Sale of Polymer

Mr. Rodriguez: It would really shock the public of this country to see how you Tories are shafting them. The Tories are opposed to public ownership in any form, as evidenced by the hon. member for York-Simcoe in his speech last Friday. Just who would be able to buy those shares of the CDC?

An hon. Member: You would never buy any.

Mr. Rodriguez: I would hope that collectively the people of Canada, their taxes, would buy them. The Economic Council of Canada, in a recent study published on March 23, 1973, stated as its main conclusion the following:

Twenty per cent of family units at the lower end of the income scale received 4 per cent of total incomes, half of it in some form of government transfers. The richest 20 per cent of family units received 45 per cent of total incomes.

• (2140)

So, who will be able to buy the shares of CDC, Mr. Speaker? Who will benefit from their ownership? Certainly it will not be the people of Canada. If the Tories are really serious about Polymer remaining under public ownership, I challenge them to bring forward, at an appropriate time and place, a motion forbidding CDC shares to be put on the market. I do not mind these children wasting their own opposition day with hopeless games, but if they want my party to be an accessory to folly they are barking up the wrong tree. The only responsible way to deal with the motion before us tonight is to vote against it, and then let us get on with the business of providing benefits for the people of Canada.

Mr. Peter Reilly (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I do not have too much time so I will try to be as brief as possible. I am a new member in this House. I notice that this afternoon the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) accused every member in my part of the House of being juvenile. It is true that compared to him, in terms of length of service in this House, and age, I am a young member. I have not yet learned all the twisting and turning and tortuous jiggery-pokery that is necessary if one is to sell one's principles down the river in order to keep a sick government in power.

An hon. Member: You are not so innocent.

Mr. Reilly: I am, in the sense that I assume the people who elected me sent me here to oppose with all my strength, all my vigour and all my honour a government which has demonstrated palpably and painfully to the people of this country that it is unfit to govern. Since nothing that has happened since the election has convinced me that I should not do that, I shall keep on opposing the government. That is precisely what I intend to do. I shall vote against this government every time I get a chance to do so. It has had ten years, four under the current administration, to demonstrate that it cannot run this country. We now have the highest rate of unemployment in ten years, and have had it for the last two years. We have rapidly accelerating, relentless inflation. We have before us all the evidence that any reasonable man would need to assume that the country has had enough. The country cannot stand any more of these children and they should be turfed out of office as soon as possible.