

Corporation Limited, one can readily see the reasons that led the liberal party to accept such a transaction.

On reading the letter addressed to the former minister of Supplies and Services (Mr. Richardson), one notes that the Corporation therein informs the minister that its profits after taxes amount to only half a million dollars as compared with \$7,100,000 in 1970.

This is the real reason that included the liberal party to disguise this sale, to answer the Canadian people between its teeth, not to indicate in the annual report the possible deficit that that corporation could show. As it is done generally and as it has been done since the beginning of this session, they wished to act on the sly. In fact, they try to make the people swallow all kinds of little scandals, by manipulating the various groups as we have seen them do with the Polymer Corporation Limited and the Canadian Development Corporation. Here is the reason that prompted the Liberal party to proceed with such a transaction in July but the Progressive Conservatives are awakening today to condemn this step. I would say that they did not condemn it because, during his comments, the member for Yukon nearly begged the New Democratic Party to support his party without making any proposal.

Did the Liberal government act logically when selling a \$242 million corporation for \$72 million? I do not think so. But if, on the other hand, the intention is to hand such an industry over to the Canadian people, I do not think that it would be the way used by the Liberal party and even less that proposed by the New Democrat Party that claims it was a good thing because it is a Crown corporation.

I think that in July 1972, the government should have, right then, asked the employees of the corporation to try and purchase it, which would have made it possible to respect the workers' right to share the profits of the business.

In this way, the problem would have been solved and over 4,414 employees would have benefited from it. But no such proposition was made.

On the one hand, the Liberal party tries to "make a back door transaction" in order to hide deficits, and, on the other hand, the Progressive Conservative party and the New Democratic Party are complaining about this manoeuvring without, however, putting forward any reasonable proposal.

In so far as we are concerned, we suggest that the government avoid such transactions in the future because nothing can be changed by tonight's vote. Whatever the result of the vote, it will in no way affect the obvious mistake that was made through the sale made in July, 1972.

The government should be more careful in the future and we suggest that, if a corporation is to be sold, it should be sold to the employees themselves.

In a field such as the highly controversial Temiscaming industry, it has been noticed that the government did not provide any assistance and that this manufacture was compelled to end its activities without even realizing that its own employees were themselves in a position to take over the enterprise and develop it with a profit.

Sale of Polymer

Therefore, this is what we ask the government to do in the future. If problems of an administrative nature or other arise in the case of some industries, this is due to their administrators having made mistakes. We suggest that the government have faith in the employees, in such cases, as they will be in a position to overhaul an enterprise and make profits.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to express my comments and I do not think it worthwhile to discuss about such a foolish motion which has been moved by the Progressive Conservative Party. We do not feel it is necessary to further discuss the miserly tactics of the Progressive Conservative and Liberal parties on the subject of the sale of the Polymer Corporation, in July 1972.

• (1610)

[*English*]

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate my first words, of course, should be said in sympathy for Her Majesty's loyal opposition which has been somewhat under attack today, largely on the ground of hypocrisy. I venture to say it has suffered a further disadvantage, and that is once again in respect of an appropriation of ideas. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) made reference to proceedings before the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, in relation to a discussion on this particular topic.

At that committee, when the representatives of the Conservative party were asked to approve Vote 10b for the development and utilization of manpower contributions, to extend the purposes of the Manpower and Immigration Act under Vote 10, appropriation Act No. 3, 1972, having regard to various programs and requirements for the Department of Manpower and Immigration, the hon. member for Yukon led representatives of the Conservative party in opposing that authorization for sums of money to make mobility possible for those who wished to avail themselves of these manpower programs. The hon. member at that time explained that this opposition was not based on the words of the vote at all but because of the procedure being followed, namely amending the previous Appropriation Act by a one dollar item. We see them following the tactic of not opposing the purpose of the estimates, the grant or the vote because they were opposed to what was explicit in the words of the estimate, but for really quite another reason.

Today, we find the lead off speaker for the opposition charging the NDP with failing to follow blindly the words of the motion we are now debating. It might help in light of all the confusion that exists in relation to the transfer of Polymer through sale to the Canada Development Corporation if I were to give something in the way of the background. In the course of 1971, after much public discussion and thorough consideration by parliament, the Canada Development Corporation was established by a special act of this parliament. The act was proclaimed on November 18, 1971 and the first meeting of the board was held on November 29.

The government established this corporation because it believed there was a substantial role to be played by a new institution backed by substantial sources of Canadi-