

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

of its plants while the city of Quebec and suburbs have lost six.

Surprisingly, among the lost plants, some were founded or established at such various times as 1914, 1907, 1961, 1940, and 1912.

There must surely be professionals among those people, I imagine, cultivated persons who are experts in their profession.

The brief further states:

Since our delegation appeared for the first time before the committee on tariffs and trade in June 1964, our manufacturers have shown growing concern at the shoe imports from socialist countries of central Europe, in particular.

Some shoe manufacturers of those countries bring out lines designed especially for export.

Mr. Speaker, last summer I had the opportunity to spend two weeks in a socialist republic. In that country a suit cost between \$50 and \$70; shoes cost from \$10 to \$15, depending on quality. All that while the carpenters and welders working in one of the world's biggest shipyards earned only \$35 a month and an engineer, a university professor earned only \$75 a month.

Since those workers do not earn enough money to buy their own production, it is obvious that the governments of those countries must look toward the export market if they want to keep their policy of full employment going.

As concerns the Asian countries, it has been well known for a long time that their shoe factories belong to foreign financiers. For the last few years, these gentlemen seem to have chosen Canada as a dumping ground for their products of dubious quality.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, for the Canadian government to allow the entry of commodities from the Asian countries is to bow before the financiers who are hiding in Europe and particularly in England. To allow the importation of shoes from communist countries is to encourage slavery, and to tolerate the present volume of imports is to create unemployment in our country.

In many small towns and communities, the shoe industry is the main source of employment of the local workers.

According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, this industry provides direct employment for 10,000 persons in Ontario and 14,000 in Quebec, while another 15,000 are employed in allied industries.

All those people are quite concerned about the increased imports and rightly feel that their future is in danger.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, could we be informed now as to what action the department intends to take to correct this deplorable situation which affects directly or indirectly about 150,000 Canadian citizens.

Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Trade and Commerce): Surely, the hon. member is not implying that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Winters) intended to deceive anyone.

Such a statement would be contrary to facts, especially since the minister wants very much to protect this Canadian industry.

The brief submitted to the Canadian committee on tariffs and trade by the Canadian Shoe Manufacturers Association was given careful consideration by officials of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Then it was referred to the Canadian delegation at the GATT conference on tariffs; negotiations are presently under way at Geneva.

This shows the minister's efforts to find a solution to the plight of our shoe manufacturers.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS—INQUIRY AS TO THE USE OF ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINE

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens): Mr. Speaker, we in this house are given to expressing concern over our procedures. Indeed some of the longest arguments I have heard in this chamber have been about time saving and improving our procedures. This of course is not unusual in deliberative bodies. But we have noted of late a public expression of concern about what is fashionably called our image. I have noted the speeches of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and his expressed desire that procedurally we move into the twentieth century.

When one considers that it is now over one year since this session began on January 18, 1966 we are faced with a situation where the calendar year is not long enough for the parliamentary year, if I may express it that way, and there is some reason for concern. I do not worship the goddess of ultra efficiency. We must never make any change which would diminish by one jot or tittle the democratic ingredients of this chamber in the interests of speed, smoothness or efficiency. Some of our