

past four years? There is more foreign ownership of Canadian firms than ever before in our history. In the past four years, an additional 200 large firms have been taken over by people who live elsewhere. There is no use kidding ourselves about this matter. Those who control the economy of this country control the destiny of the country. That must be crystal clear to everyone.

There is some reference to the problem of foreign ownership in the Speech from the Throne, but we have no indication what the legislation will be, how restrictive will be its terms, and whether it will be effective at all or not. It breaks my heart to realize that secondary industry has been neglected by scores of past governments. Both the Tories and the Liberals can share the blame for the lack of secondary industry in our nation, for the gradual sell-out of our vast stores of resources to people in other countries, until the point has been reached that Canada is almost simply a source of raw materials for other nations. All this is inexcusable when we find that many of our young people whom we train in our universities cannot get jobs in their own country. This will be a big issue in the coming election. We will demand that steps be taken to repatriate the Canadian economy, to let us be masters in our own house, to let us have the opportunity to make decisions as to whether raw materials will be fabricated here in job intensive industries that would provide hundreds of thousands of jobs for those young Canadians who desperately need them.

What has been done about this matter? There has been very little talk, and absolutely no action to date. But with an election due in a few months time, you can bet that the administration will come up with some kind of program in the hope that it will fool the Canadian people again. I am convinced that far too many of the Canadian people understand the government's past programs, and I do not believe they will be fooled again.

In my view a just society means an equitable tax system. Do we have an equitable tax system in Canada? Last session we passed a tax reform bill. We made some welcome changes. But did we get the equitable tax system that we need to bring about the just society? We did not. I hold in my hand a table of statistics produced by an ex-cabinet minister, showing the type of taxation that has existed here for years and that has not been corrected. The facts would be most unpalatable to the Canadian public if they knew them.

With respect to mineral fuels, companies engaged in this section of the mining industry made book profits of \$795 million during the period 1965 to 1968. The oil companies are practically all foreign controlled, and they paid taxes on only 5.7 per cent of their total book profits. Out of \$795 million book profits they paid taxes on only \$45 million. Is this an equitable tax system? Why does the government insist on catching those in the middle income tax brackets, taking hundreds of dollars out of their cheques every payday? These oil and gas companies will pull out of Canada once our resources are depleted. Has the government been on guard for Canadians in this respect? It is utter nonsense to say it has. Metal mining in the same period 1965 to 1968 showed book profits of \$1,707 million, and paid taxes on only \$222 million, at a rate of 13 per cent. Yet the government talks about the just society. I say

*Speech from the Throne*

you need an equitable tax system if you are to have a just society in Canada.

My time has almost expired, Mr. Speaker. Several other matters that I wish to deal with, including the environment, I will cover at a later date. I trust that when this debate is finished and legislation is introduced based on the suggestions in the Speech from the Throne, the government will be willing to accept good amendments to its bills because I am certain many of the bills will desperately need amendment.

• (1630)

**Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) and the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Lajoie), the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply for their interesting and invigorating speeches. I fear that the balance of this debate may not have lived up to the standard they set because it seems to me to have followed the traditional pattern of Throne Speech debates, that is, the government and all its works are praised by members on this side of the House and there is nothing but condemnation and negativism from the other side. I think the people of this country would be happily surprised if this rigid pattern were broken one day. I speak for only one constituency in this debate and it is my intention to break away from the pattern because the things I wish to speak of on behalf of my constituents are in the nature of criticisms and critical comments on government programs.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to speak to the House about the issue which above all others is most widely discussed and is the subject of the greatest controversy and concern in my riding, that is the application of the bilingual program of the government to the Public Service of Canada. This program is discussed almost as if it existed in two separate worlds in this city. On one side, there is a thin veneer of high officials, of pundits in the media and others to whom this program appears to be highly successful. An air of euphoria seems to float over their discussion of the program and, indeed, it is regarded by many people on this side almost as an act of ill-will and malice to utter any criticism of it.

On the other hand, and I regret to say that the group of which I now speak is in the majority, are the large numbers of members of the public service and the public in general who are increasingly expressing concern about the implications of the program and the manner in which it is being applied in practice. These people see evidence which cannot be denied that the program in their opinion is not satisfactory. This great gap exists in discussions in this city and is very rarely bridged, although it was bridged to some extent by the interesting comments on the subject by the Official Languages Commissioner in his first report.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that the problems created by the application of the bilingual program are serious and that they cannot be ignored by this Parliament. We are entitled to ask ourselves why these problems have developed and what constructive and positive steps we can take to alleviate them. We were all here three and a half years ago when the Official Languages Act was passed in an atmosphere of outstanding good will and