

ownership rights and the right to direct your economy for all time.

• (1540)

There is undeniably a tremendous hostility because of the very magnitude of the problem. It will accelerate during the next three, four or five years because at the present time what is worrying the multinational corporations of the world and the three big trading blocs is that an overwhelming proportion of these are owned and controlled in the United States. The Japanese have the funds and the will to acquire their share. They will go searching out. The Europeans will need their share. In this flow of buying out the resources and markets of the world, there will inevitably be a counter reaction of tremendous hostility and resentment. I only hope that when this resentment comes we will have the grace to say it was our fault, *mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa*, and that when finally it becomes a political realization we will say it is something we ourselves should have and could have foreseen and can hardly blame the dependent nations for engaging in it.

I do not want to go any further into the operations of the multinational corporations. I suspect greatly that the claims that are made about the benefits of their technology to countries such as Canada are exaggerated and that if we had a positive economic policy of our own we could easily equal the so-called advantages and expand well beyond them because it is not technical efficiency which counts. It is the relationship of the efficiency to the supply and factors of production of the economy of a country such as Canada. If we rely on the promises of technology we must remember that our problems are much more. The promises of technology really demand tremendous capital and capital is not in surplus in Canada. Normally when you make an economic decision you make it to use to the utmost the factors that are in surplus, as in our case labour and employment, and to husband your resources in the area of capital. You can have a perfectly rational technology and efficiency which on purely technical grounds seems to be superior. If it employs more of the factor that is absent in the economy and less of the factor that is plentiful in the economy then it is not a rational economic decision.

They sell production techniques, but these techniques which they export to Canada and across the world are the production techniques they developed for their own domestic market. That they could be equally suitable to countries all over the world is somewhat doubtful. There is no reason to believe they are. In fact, the introduction of technologies that are superior to the state of the art in many countries creates great strains and stresses which have a distinct impact on the social, cultural and political fabric of each of these countries. As I have suggested we need an over-all attack on the problem. Because the problem is so serious, and so large a part of the population of this country is aware of it and has as they say a gut feeling that something is wrong, I think we need the co-operation perhaps of all parties in developing it. I must simply say that I do not expect that kind of policy to come from what we euphemistically call an establishment here in Canada. I do not expect it. I do not blame the cabinet for this kind

Foreign Takeovers Review Act

of a bill. It is the kind of bill which could be promoted only by the people who are here in the civil service.

You know, Galbraith yesterday talked about the structure in the United States and the symbiosis, as he said, of bureaucrats and the great corporations and the social establishment. Symbiosis I suspect is a good word for shacking up or living together. We have the same situation here. It is understandable. You do not find many deputy ministers talking individually with farmers or small businessmen who have gone bankrupt, had tax problems and perhaps had something to say about the kind of policies which led to this. Or you do not find them talking to small entrepreneurs who are successful. The conjunction here, the meeting of the minds here in Ottawa, is between the bureaucrats in the large corporations and in our very large federal departments. It is understandable. They belong to the same jet set. I do not mean the watering holes of the world but rather the same international conferences in the Genevas, the Tokyos, the Parises or the Washingtons. They meet on the same plane and attend these same conferences and meetings.

As I say, they do not see any representative of the real guts or the vast majority of the people who make this economy go. The president and the vice-president of a corporation and a deputy minister have roughly the same standards of living and the same salaries. They have roughly the same size of organization and the same number of employees. They have a billion dollar budget in each case and perhaps more in some cases, but the relationships and comparisons are reasonably of the same order. They have the same motivation. Their 22,000 employees they would like to see grow to 25,000 tomorrow. That would be a significant indication of their importance. Applied to the private sector they are judged now not by the old classic definition of how well they can handle the assets entrusted to them or the profits made but more on the growth of their assets and the growth of the number of employees. This largely applies to departments. They have the same kind of motivation. They also have the same kind of utter confidence in themselves that they know what is good for people. So you find them not really considering the problems of small business or service industries today but how can they goose the economy with some physical leap forward into technology.

Technology for what? To produce things people do not want. It may be the moon, supersonic aircraft or technology to provide services the people do not want. They have the same priorities for destroyers, CF-5's or hydrofoils. Now, the current one going on is that somehow there is a technology of STOL aircraft which might place Canada in the forefront. The large corporations and bureaucrats get their heads together and talk about sums of \$200 million to invest in this project. I do not know why people want to go from Montreal to Ottawa in 48 minutes instead of two hours. I do not see how many people, less than one per cent of the population, would ever take advantage of such a service. However, I can see how the people of Canada would pay out \$200 million to provide such things as more clothes, better houses, transportation, food, and the things we need in so many areas of our population.