

ment or other members. Nobody in this House has the authority to transfer time accruing to each member, and I do not accept at all that procedure.

**The Chairman:** In any case, the hon. member for Longueuil was also present when the agreement was reached, and it was unanimously agreed that each member would be entitled to 15 minutes to use as he wishes, either to make a speech or put questions to the minister. Then, the minister may be recognized at any time, if he wishes to use his 15 minutes—he is in his right—whether he uses his time at the end of the debate is his decision.

[English]

**Mr. Saltzman:** Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to grant the minister the indulgence he wants so as to give him the opportunity of speaking, providing it is understood that he replies to the questions I am going to raise rather than to those of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

I would tend to support the motion moved by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings if it were made retroactive, because I think that just about every minister of industry, trade and commerce that we have had in this country has been derelict in his duty. I do not know whether this is the fault of the minister we have had at any particular time or whether it is because of the advice the minister gets from his departmental officials, but I rather suspect that it is because of the advice he gets from his department. In any event, it is not our job to question that or know about it. After all, it is the minister who is held responsible in this House.

● (1540)

Wherever ministers have been getting their advice on economic and industrial policy in Canada it has been terrible, and almost invariably policy has been based on continentalism all the way through. Whenever we talk about productivity or the rationalization of industry, it is always rationalization with the United States.

The chickens are now coming home to roost. Up until recently, when the United States was fighting a war, there were tremendous demands by the United States for all kinds of products Americans could not produce themselves, so the problems in respect of foreign ownership and their consequence on our productivity were obscured. Now the United States is in a recession, and fortunately for humanity's sake the war is over. We are now beginning to see the consequences of foreign ownership in this country.

I should like to point to one industry, although I could point to many, to show that the effect of foreign ownership has not been a Machiavellian scheme to brainwash us or change our culture, but has been one of giving us an incredibly inefficient industrial structure. We see this everywhere we look; whether it is in respect of chemicals, rubber or electronics, the intrusion of foreign ownership in this country has prevented Canada from living up to its potential.

There seems to have been some kind of reverse alchemy at work which, in this country with all its advantages, natural resources, people and energy, has turned our gold into dust. They have reversed the process. We would have been better off without a Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce than having one that has led us into conti-

### *Business of Supply*

entalism, whether in respect of the Canada-U.S. auto agreement or the rubber industry. We are now beginning to see what happens.

Most of us have received a petition from the Canadian rubber workers asking us to support increases in tariffs. This industry is in danger of going under. It is not as though the minister was not warned about the consequences of the situation. For years it has been pointed out that this kind of attitude on the part of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, with lack of coordination of regional development policy, foreign ownership legislation, and combines legislation, would lead to an incredibly inefficient rubber industry, almost totally foreign owned and inefficient compared to that of the United States.

The argument has always been that we have overcome this kind of inefficiency by low wage rates in Canada. Traditionally this is what we have done; we have overcome the inefficient structure of certain industries by paying our workers less than those in the United States. This cannot go on forever. The wages of our workers are now approaching those of workers in the United States, but our industrial productivity is not approaching that of the United States, and that is why the cry goes up that our workers are getting too much and are asking for too much. The fact is that they are not getting too much and they are not asking for more than their U.S. counterparts who are doing less work. But our industry is certainly not as effective as industry in the United States.

At the time we brought Michelin into Canada there was a warning that the rubber makers in this country would ask for tariff concessions. They got those tariff concessions to rationalize continentalism. The result is that production is being shifted to the United States. That is the consequence of branch plant economies. The minute problems develop in one country where the corporation originates the branch plant, that part of the world suffers, and we are paying the price of being a branch plant economy with this production shift to the United States. In spite of every give-away the Minister of Finance has been able to put forward, including concessions in the way of corporate taxes and write-offs to offset the DISC program in the United States, this production is being shifted out of the country.

There are many things that could be said and that I would like to say, but 15 minutes is not enough time in which to vent my anger about the insane policies pursued by the government. I do not think 15 minutes will be enough time for the minister to reply or to explain away generations of incompetence in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in directing industrial forces in this country. He is not going to have 15 minutes, but whatever time he has will not be long enough to accomplish that.

Since the minister has asked us to pose specific questions, perhaps he will have the courtesy to listen to those I wish to ask. The minister has said on many occasions that there is no such thing as industrial strategy. He laughs at the idea of an over-all industrial strategy. Instead of that he says we have sectoral strategy—we have specific strategies for specific industries. In view of the enormous lay-offs in the rubber industry and the demands by workers in that industry for some tariff protection, will the minister