

*Natural Resources—Development*

trade balance. Fourth, he wants wider Canadian financial participation in companies which are subsidiaries of parent companies in the United States, particularly or in other foreign countries. Fifth, he desires greater opportunities for employment.

These are all very laudable objectives, and in my opinion are matters that require some attention. Unfortunately, however, neither the hon. gentleman nor any of his colleagues has so far given us a clue as to what they would do about any of these matters except in one instance, and I want to refer to that right now, when the Leader of the Opposition in his address, as will be found at page 1156 of *Hansard* for February 11, referred to the speech made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Chicago on October 16, 1956. He put on the record four requests, if one might call them that, which the Minister of Trade and Commerce made of these United States corporations as their business applies to their subsidiaries in Canada, and he quoted this with approval. I want to use his own words. He said:

Among the things he asked for were those which he had ridiculed when they were advanced by this party over and over again. In the course of his speech there he said this: 1. Let Canadians have a chance to become minority shareholders in subsidiaries. 2. Provide more opportunity for advancement of Canadians to top jobs. 3. Let Canadian branch plants take on more export business. 4. Make public more information on branch operations in Canada.

Those were four of the things which the Minister of Trade and Commerce in Chicago asked the United States corporations to provide, and the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that these were the objectives which his party had advocated in this country and in this house.

I am not going to deal with all four requests, but let us examine the first one. The Leader of the Opposition quotes with approval as one of his party's great objectives, "Let Canadians have a chance to become minority shareholders in subsidiaries". Now, Mr. Speaker, is that an objective worthy of a great national policy? If Sir John A. Macdonald could hear this I wonder how he would feel hearing the Leader of the Opposition say that he approves as an objective the plea, "Let Canadians have a chance to become minority shareholders in subsidiaries". Have we sunk so low in relation to our good neighbour to the south that we would be satisfied if they would only let us have a small share of their subsidiaries in our own country?

Is that a great national policy? I am sure Sir John A. Macdonald would have brushed that aside and called it petty and unworthy of this great nation. We have the resources and the population, yet we are begging great

United States corporations to please let us have a small piece of control over their subsidiaries in our own country. That is why I say that if we are going to realize any of these objectives we are going to have to seek wider public participation.

This brings us squarely to the fundamental difference between the approach of the C.C.F. party and the approach of the other parties in this house. I say that with all due respect. They have their points of view and are entitled to them and I respect their points of view; but certainly when they come before parliament and stand in the public forum and say to the Canadian people, "We want to accomplish the five things contained in this motion but we want to do this without any planning, without any public ownership and without any interference by the government", they should not expect to command support for their point of view.

Just to make matters more confused the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources rose to his feet immediately after the Leader of the Opposition put forward his motion and pointed out all the reasons why none of these things could be done by the federal government. As if the motion was not weak enough to start with the minister appeared to want to completely demolish it, if I may use that term. Is that the kind of thing that will bring about the changes set out in this motion, or at some point will we say to ourselves, "If we want to develop our nation and mobilize the natural, material and human resources of Canada for the greatest benefit of all people in this country, then this government and the provincial governments and municipal governments will have to meet and discuss and co-operate in finding a field in which each can most properly apply itself to accomplish these things. We must not sit back and wait for some magic wand to be waved by some huge corporation in the United States in order that these things may be done for us."

Either we are serious about this matter or we are not. If we are serious that it is the function of government as such, whether it be federal, provincial or municipal, to use its organizational power and its financing power to bring about these developments, then I should not think we would need to waste time waiting upon some private institutions to do it but should get together on all levels of government.

We do not need to be involved in an argument on the question of provincial autonomy. The Canadian constitution, the British North America Act, is there for all to read. All of us may not interpret it in exactly the same way, but there is fairly common agreement