

We seem to have developed in Canada the kind of businessman who wants a protected market. If you look at the history of a good many of the small manufacturers in Ontario you will find that they were prepared to accept the "Golden Triangle" as a market and, because of favourable freight rates, they shipped their goods, whatever they might be, to the rest of this country. They really had no interest in attempting to do what this country must do to attain the desired standard of living; that is to export goods.

I remember a vice-president of a trading company in Hong Kong telling me that Canadians were the worst traders in the world. When he wanted to buy something for China or for Hong Kong, right away a salesman would be in from Australia and two from Japan. As far as Canada was concerned, six weeks later he might get a letter from a Canadian firm saying, "Send us the airfare and we will think about sending a salesman to talk to you." I am very much afraid the Canadian businessman has developed that kind of a reputation. Why has that taken place? Canadians are not aggressive enough. In many cases they are just not hungry enough.

Over the last twenty years there has been gradual erosion of incentive and motivation. Is it the businessman's fault? In many cases I think not. I do not know how many dozens of businessmen have said to me, "Chuck, why should I work any harder? Why should I build a larger business? Why should I put 12 or 15 hours a day into my business when most of the time from here on in I am working for the government?" That feeling is accurate. Our tax policies have been such that we have not really wanted anyone to expand. We have really not wanted the country to develop. We have allowed our entrepreneurs to go so far and then have cut them off at the pass.

Entrepreneurs are the most productive people in the country. I suspect every member of the House of Commons knows several businessmen who have, shall we say, dropped out of the business world because of our taxation policies and because they have not had a chance to keep a sufficient portion of what they earned. With that kind of a climate, no wonder the industrial plants of Ontario are aging. It is no wonder these companies cannot compete. This situation goes back to what transpired in the 1950s and 1960s when things were a little easier and they could get away with that attitude. No longer is that the case.

Let us take a look at the situation regarding education in Canada. Certainly this is a provincial responsibility. I find it shocking, shameful and sad that in the next year we will be bringing 100,000 tradesmen into this country at a time when we have over one million people unemployed. If this government at any time in the last 15 years had realized what was happening, taken the initiative and worked with, instead of against, provincial governments, an apprenticeship program could have been developed. We would then have those 100,000 trained workers. Instead, we will import skilled labour, and we are still not training our own labour. I honestly do not believe we can blame the unions or all of the provincial governments for this, although part of the blame is theirs. However, we can

### *Supply*

certainly blame the federal government and a bureaucracy which have provided no leadership in this area, whatsoever.

● (1740)

We talk about technology of the future and where the jobs are to be found. I like what the government has done regarding Telidon. However, that is one small matter. This country could have been a world leader in pay-television. There were a number of companies here who wanted to go ahead, and could have been world leaders. But what happens in Canada? The CRTC just killed them. They studied it, thought about it, could not make up their minds. This went on and on to the point where these companies were not been able to do that well. They will admit that they lost out due to the failure of this government and its commissions to deal with reality.

There is another example of this, Mr. Speaker, in my own part of Canada, and I speak about the Port of Vancouver. In the last ten years the Port of Vancouver has lost a substantial amount of shipping to the Port of Seattle. To be fair, that is partly because, when unloading a lot of material for the U.S., it is better to go to Seattle than Vancouver. However, there is a contrast in business attitudes.

In 1950 Seattle was a very poor port; very little was going on. The people of King County and Seattle decided they wanted to be the major port on the north west coast, so they got the money together, issued bonds, built the port and they now have something like 18 cranes for containerized cargo. In Vancouver we have three. I might add that the container cargo concept originated in Vancouver, so you would think we would be the leader in the area. That is not the case.

To sharpen the contrast, if someone wants to ship a million widgets into Seattle they can call a board of directors meeting and a decision on the rate to be charged can be made in the course of an afternoon. If you go into Vancouver and do the same thing it will take you probably six weeks to get a rate out of Ottawa, 4,000 miles away. Even then the people making the decision will have no concept of what is involved.

However, I think there is one more important issue here, which goes to the root of the problem in our country today. The philosophy in Seattle was: We will build our port and go out and attract the shippers because we have the facilities. The National Harbours Board attitude in Canada is: when the demand develops sufficiently, then we will consider putting the facilities in. That difference in attitude and emphasis is the difference between Canada and some of the great trading countries of the world. It exists today and will probably continue to exist.

I do not want to be totally negative. What do we do to correct this? How do we change attitudes in Canada? How do I convince my colleagues opposite of some of the things they perhaps can do to really get Canada moving again? Let me say, frankly, I find it difficult to blame the Liberal Party for much of the problem—not totally difficult, mind you, but a little bit. The blame does not really, fall entirely on those gentlemen who sit opposite me, but on the bureaucrats. The government has run this country in such a way it has allowed