

Belanger Limited received a DREE grant in 1970 of over \$200,000, or rather was offered over \$200,000.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): They never got it.

Mr. Murray McBride (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is deliberately misleading the House and telling untruths. He knows that what he says is in error, and no member has the right to deliberately mislead the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And you have no right to split an infinitive.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I cannot accept the point of order that has been raised because it is merely a question of debate. The hon. member will have an opportunity in due time to refute or to argue what has been said by the Leader of the NDP.

Mr. McBride: The point I am making is that the record has been clarified in the House and no federal grant went to the Tappan-Belanger plant. This fact is well known and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) should not perpetuate an error.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if this servant of a higher authority had had the decency and charity to wait in his seat, he would have heard me complete my sentence.

Mr. McBride: Why raise it if it is irrelevant and not part of your case?

Mr. Lewis: Sit still and listen. No one other than the hon. member is misleading the House.

Mr. McBride: Try telling the truth.

Mr. Lewis: The parent company was offered a grant of over \$200,000. Members will recall that when the matter was raised in the House the minister had forgotten that it was offered, and later informed the House that it was never given but that, in any event, it was cancelled on February 11 last. The date of the question and the date of the cancellation are of some importance.

Mr. McBride: That is untrue also. He made the statement on national television on the very day reference was made to the closing of the plant.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, will you have this man—I forget his name and his riding; I do not want to remember it—remain in his seat and keep quiet.

Mr. McBride: Don't pretend you are interested in Carleton Place if you don't even know who the representative is.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I think the hon. member should be fair to the leader of the NDP and let him make his speech. In due time the hon. member can take the floor and make his own argument. It is the responsibility of the Chair to keep order and members should address themselves to the Chair. I do not think that exchanges from one side to the other by members shouting from their seats will help make progress in the House.

Regional Development

Mr. Lewis: I think the only thing to do is to ignore the comments from across the way. Grants have been offered to a subsidiary of ITT to start a pulp mill when another pulp mill was closing down in Témiscamingue in the same province. There have been huge grants to povertystricken organizations like Parsons and Whitmore to build a pulp mill in Prince Albert, which is in operation, and another mill in Meadow Lake which the new Saskatchewan government cancelled, while pulp mills were laying off people in Quebec, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Ontario. There has been no plan whatever and, I suggest to you that a good many of the jobs that DREE has created—50,000 jobs for the hundreds of millions of dollars spent—are not too many anyway—were created at the expense of jobs of other people in other locations in this country.

I have already drawn attention on another occasion to the conflict of interest of members of the advisory board, Mr. Estey and Mr. Cork, which I think is not terribly serious, except that it indicates the kind of people from whom the minister and the department take advice, the kind of people whom they want to have.

Let me look for a minute at the situation in the disadvantaged areas. Remembering that I must not go over the 30 minutes, let me point out some indicators that show how utterly ineffective this very expensive program has been. Let us consider the investment in manufacturing. In 1961, investment in Quebec represented 55.1 per cent of investment in Ontario. Ten years later in 1971 the ratio dropped to a dismal 40.9 per cent. The Atlantic region's share of employment and manufacturing in 1961 was 4.6 per cent. Nine years later in 1970 it was about the same, 4.5 per cent. Quebec's share in 1961 was 33 per cent; in 1970, it was down to 31.3 per cent.

• (1220)

More relevant perhaps, and more important in terms of human welfare, is that in 1961 the Atlantic region's average weekly wages in manufacturing were 78 per cent of the average weekly wages in Ontario, and in 1970 its average weekly wages were only 75.6 per cent. The gap was growing, Mr. Speaker. The average weekly wages in what is known as the industrial composite, which takes in more than manufacturing, in 1961 in the Atlantic region were 89.1 per cent of those in Ontario, and in 1970 were 81 per cent, which represents a very serious increase of about 10 per cent in the difference between the Atlantic region and Ontario. The same is true for Quebec. Quebec's average weekly wages in manufacturing in 1961 represented 89.2 per cent of those in Ontario, and in 1970 this dropped to 87.6 per cent. If you take the Atlantic provinces' average annual wages and salaries together you find a drop from 79 per cent in 1961, as compared with Ontario, to 73 per cent in 1970 as compared with Ontario.

I am using the Ontario comparison rather than the national average because obviously the national average includes the low wage rates in the Atlantic provinces and in Quebec, and therefore would give a distorted comparison. The only sensible comparison is with a province like Ontario that will not include the low wage rates of these provinces. The same is true with respect to the per capita income in these areas.