

write-off privileges which would bring it up to a competitive level.

A great deal has also been said about production capacity and I should like to relate an incident which happened this summer. A company from Sweden approached me during the recess about a product. We did some pricing and I said we could not import it because it was too costly. It was a heavy casting. I told them that we have a large foundry in Canada and I would be more interested in a licensing agreement on the product. I was told it was no longer made in Sweden but is cast in Portugal because labour in Sweden is so costly. Then I found they had been negotiating with a firm in the United States which could produce the same casting at 20 per cent cheaper than Portugal. I contacted one of our large foundries and found that we could produce it even cheaper than the United States because our technology in that particular type of casting is even more advanced than theirs. We are going ahead in negotiations with this company and hope that by early next year we will have a licensing agreement. We hope the product can be made totally in Canada and some of the production exported to Sweden. The labour cost is not so great where there is advanced technology.

A great deal has been said about productivity, and the government had had a study prepared by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the DM-10 group. I should like to see that study and the whole subject brought into the House of Commons for debate, and then go to the committee for discussion.

Too much nonsense is talked about productivity today, Mr. Speaker, and people who do not understand the productive process make remarks about low productivity. They imply that Canadian workers are not productive when in many cases they are using worn out plant and machinery while trying to be productive in line with other countries. We should define productivity. The scale being produced by the OECD is phony as a \$3 bill. We need our own definition related to our economy. I do not give a damn what other countries say about productivity; I am concerned about what is going on here.

While some people in industry have made submissions to the government on their position at the GATT negotiations, in many cases there has been no consultation whatsoever. A matter so important should be brought into the open. Seventy oral conversations across the country are not an adequate base. The government produces studies but we do not see them and this is part of the whole secrecy syndrome.

● (1750)

A study was produced on business and government relations. We want it to be tabled in the House after the government has examined it so that we can consider it. The working paper on consensus should be brought forward and tabled in the House. As well, there is a memorandum on initiatives for small business which should be brought before the House, debated, and referred to a committee to enable us to consider that important question.

Canadian Trade Policy

The secrecy syndrome is all-pervasive. For instance I learned that the Ministry of State for Science and Technology produced a study on the ramifications and implications of the 200-mile offshore limit. Would it not have been proper to give a copy of the study to hon. members who participated in discussions on the law of the sea? Would it not have been better if they could have read the report and then attended the Law of the Sea Conference? Would they not have understood better what was going on and been better equipped to engage in dialogue? Would they not have been better informed? In my travels outside this country I have discovered that parliamentarians and legislators of other countries are better treated in most cases by their governments than we are, and better informed. Other governments are more willing to provide information than our government is. Let me add that Statistics Canada produces every quarter, I think for the Ministry of State for Science and Technology a special study on manufactured products. At any rate, Statistics Canada regularly produces a secret report which is provided to the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I submit that it should not be secret; we should be entitled to examine it.

Business evolves, Mr. Speaker. Most businesses in this country did not grow up in the last two or three years, or even the last seven or eight. They have evolved over long periods. Mistakes can be costly. Let me illustrate my point by telling hon. members a story I often tell people of my town. It concerns the Steel Company of Canada, now located in Hamilton. One division of that industry is the Stanley Works. The Stanley Works used to be located in Dundas, where I presently live. Some years ago an argument arose between the company and the township as to who would pay for a drain to take away water flowing off a certain roof. The industry said it would not pay and the town said it would not pay but would build the drain and bill the company. The company said, "If you do this, we shall move out of Dundas." It did. It moved to Hamilton, expanded, and became one of this country's major industries.

I am surprised that the NDP should treat my party as if it were the only opposition in this House. Instead of criticizing the government, that party spends much time criticizing my party, as if it perceives us as the government of the future. NDP members spend much time asking for our position on this and that. Hon. members opposite have talked about free trade and the U.S. Trade Act of 1974 has been mentioned in this House; yet not one NDP member asked what is the government's position on that United States act. My party wants to know what is the government's position?

The minister mentioned the difficulties of consortiums and industries operating in foreign countries. Consortiums, because of their very nature, much each be different, because each individual negotiation is different from all others. After all, the purpose of the consortium is to enable various companies and entities to bring their resources and talent together in order to complete an industrial undertaking.

When all is said and done, perhaps it is easier to criticize by hindsight than to make constructive proposals. I say that for this reason, and will close on this note: we must take advantage