

the budget proposals which are still being debated in this House. What did that company do? Did it use that money for job creation and to extend its operations? Not at all.

The most significant thing Alcan did was to shut down its operations in St. Lawrence, Newfoundland. That fluorspar mine was not losing money. Alcan operated in that community for many decades, thus making St. Lawrence totally dependent upon that mining operation. In spite of the assistance Alcan received from Canadians and the benefits it received from the mini-budget, the firm has decided that it can make more money by importing its fluorspar from Mexico, and will shut down its Canadian operation entirely. The result of that action will be economic ruin for that entire community.

Another large multinational corporation is Falconbridge. It owes Canadians \$34 million in deferred taxes. On account of the Finance Minister's mini-budget, it will gain approximately \$2 million. What is Falconbridge doing in terms of exercising its social responsibility to Canadians, and particularly mining communities? It has laid off approximately 4,000 workers on a temporary basis, and 500 workers permanently. At the same time this corporation is expanding in South Africa, Rhodesia, and Chile. Those are three marvellous countries in terms of their governments. Those governments are extremely reactionary and severe in terms of repressing their own people. But Falconbridge expands in those countries, lays off Canadians, and is in receipt of tax benefits from our government!

Next I should like to deal with Northern Telecom, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Bell Canada. Its assets increased from \$363 million in 1970 to \$705 million in 1976. That poor little corporation has received some \$3 million from the government's mini-budget. That is cash which Northern Telecom does not really need. In fact it does not need it at all. Is it taking that cash and creating jobs for Canadians? Not at all. That corporation is also laying off workers in Canada. Approximately 1,000 have been laid off, or will be laid off by that company. Northern Telecom is expanding in the United States and Turkey, but it is receiving financial assistance from Canadians. That is the manner in which that company exercises its corporate responsibilities.

Many Liberal backbenchers from the province of Quebec are interested in Noranda Mines. What about that poor little multinational? Between 1970 and 1976 it more than doubled its assets in Canada. Now they stand at \$2,093 billion in terms of its assets. But unlike ordinary Canadian workers or farmers, it gets away with owing taxes. It owes the people of Canada some \$86 million in deferred taxes and, as we know, not only do such companies not pay interest on those taxes, they never pay them back. Noranda will receive from the Minister of Finance, who is from the province of Quebec himself, out of his mini-budget proposals, about \$5 million this year, an additional handout from the people of Canada.

• (1532)

What is Noranda doing? Is it taking that money to expand its operations? Not at all; it has laid off some 500 workers in four different mining communities in Canada, and there are

Mining Unemployment

another 1,700 miners in the Gaspé region working for Noranda whose jobs are in severe jeopardy. But once again Noranda is not simply cutting back. It is cutting back in Canada, but elsewhere in the world it is going onward and upward.

Noranda is now considering a major expansion of its copper facilities in Chile. It has been operating in Chile for some time, and now it has a major study under way which is intended to lead to a significant expansion of its copper operation in that country. Once again the people of Canada, ordinary workers wherever they live, whether they live in cities, towns or villages, are paying through the tax system channelled right through our Department of Finance into the pockets of this large multinational, not funds to be used to create jobs in Canada but funds that will be used to create jobs elsewhere in the world. That has to stop, Mr. Speaker.

Then of course there is dear old INCO, that poor, poor multinational. The figures are perhaps well known now, even to members on the government side. INCO has had, in terms of profits earned in Canada in the past decade, net profits of \$1.7 billion. This year alone they have had a net profit for the first nine months of \$95 million. They owe the people of Canada in deferred taxes \$378 million. They received in financial assistance through the Export Development Corporation \$70 million. This year, in 1977, in assistance from the taxpayers of Canada, they received from the Minister of Finance in his mini-budget a few weeks ago, \$10 million. What is INCO doing? Everyone knows what INCO is doing. INCO is laying off Canadian workers in Sudbury, Thompson, Manitoba and Port Colborne.

But again we should not despair for INCO; we should despair for Canadians, because with the \$70 million in special financial assistance provided for Canadian workers INCO is expanding, but not in Canada. INCO is expanding in Guatemala and Indonesia, two countries that are quite distant from our own land.

When the issue was raised with officials of INCO about their cut-backs, because sometimes cut-backs have to take place in certain areas, and they were asked why they did not choose some of their operations abroad, a senior branch executive of INCO said that they could get away with it in Canada but they could not get away with it in Indonesia. That shows just how much the Liberal government is prepared to stand up for the interests of Canadian workers.

I could give other examples, but I will not. There are five companies, but the pattern is a common one—tax benefits, write-off concessions intended to create jobs, but not having that effect at all. The same companies are laying off workers in Canada and expanding their operations in other parts of the world. I say on behalf of my colleagues that this pattern of the systematic write-off of Canadian resources at the same time that it is convenient to multinational corporations and profoundly inconvenient to Canadian workers has to stop. We recognize, for example, as the other parties in the House are not prepared to recognize, that there are not only problems with multinationals that are owned and operated abroad but