

Supply

after this program has had its full impact, and whereas before, if you had driven into that town unannounced, unprepared, and without a room reservation, you spent the night in your car or on the street, this time there were rooms available everywhere. What we were faced with was a ghost town, an economic collapse of major dimensions. That, Sir, was the Liberal Government's answer to Canadian ownership: drive out the foreign devils.

Let us talk about the foreign devils, because later on in his diatribe before the committee Mr. Hurtig made reference to "cultural baggage". That is an interesting phrase. That was the first time I had ever heard it. I asked him what he meant by "cultural baggage". His response was something like this: When foreign firms come into Canada, whether it is Japan, India, the U.S., Germany, France or England, wherever they come from, they bring some of their own people with them. That is the "cultural baggage" to which Mr. Hurtig alluded. These people bring with them books that they read in their homeland, they bring with them the habits of their homeland, they bring with them the business practices of their homeland. All of that, Sir, is right here in these minutes, in the words of Mel Hurtig. I might have been prepared to listen to that gentleman and accept some of his supposed wisdom until we came upon this blind spot. I can only say that, as far as I am concerned and, I would hope, as far as all Members of this House are concerned, that is a racist remark which does not belong in the minutes of any standing committee of this House of Commons. Just as sure as the people who invest in Canada from outside bring in their own people, whether it is at the management level or at whatever level of expertise they may have to lend to the project, most assuredly they are no different from those people who emigrated from their homeland to come to Canada, whether it is from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, or wherever. So I reject that kind of thinking.

I would like to talk about Canadian investment for a moment because throughout this debate we have heard about the sins of foreign investment, but one component which has been absent in this debate is the Canadian component overseas. We do not hear anything from the Opposition about the Canadian dollars which have been driven out of Canada to be invested in the U.S., Japan, Great Britain, Germany or elsewhere. We hear nothing about that.

Let me tell you about a little fellow who runs a sawmill of a special type in the small community of Nakusp. He is selectively logging, and doing a very good job of it. He often cleans up behind the big time operators, but he is selectively logging one kind of wood, that is, white pine. He cuts that wood into what are called cants that are perhaps 12 by 12 or 16 by 16 in dimension. He ships those by refrigerator car in order to preserve them from a sort of blue stain which develops on them. He ships them all the way down to North Carolina to a Canadian firm which manufactures wood for furniture. They then take these big cants and shave them, and those shavings, thinly sliced, are used as white pine veneers on furniture. They have another operation in Montreal that looks after the east-

ern market, but it is a Canadian operation down there and it is the largest furniture wood producer in the U.S. Now I see nothing wrong with that, nothing wrong at all, because there is an exchange of money, an exchange of expertise and an exchange of products. That same operation could just as easily take place here, so why was it not encouraged?

I now want to reverse the scenario and look at an American company which came into Canada to the riding of the Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), the former Prime Minister of Canada. The company is St. Regis Pulp and Paper. Not too long ago our Minister of State for Forestry had the opportunity to go through this pulp and paper operation. I was already familiar with it because I had spent time there. I can tell you that it has a very remarkable reforestation record, better than many I have seen.

Finally, let me tell you about Weyerhaeuser, a large American company in the forest products industry, whose location in Canada was supported by the Canadian IWA. It came in and took over a major forest management project in British Columbia, while Canadians who wanted to do the same thing were turned down. The reason was that the IWA, in its wisdom, felt it could get a much better bargaining unit going with Weyerhaeuser than with a Canadian group, and I have to agree with that. The bottom line is that both firms are highly productive and Canadians do not view them as being American firms. They are part of the family working in Canada, creating jobs, and generating employment opportunities and dollars for Canada.

● (1600)

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to contribute to this debate, although it is a pity that the debate must take place. The purpose of the motion is to express concern, which my Party shares, over the failure of the new Government to protect Canada from the problem of direct foreign investment, with specific reference to the case of Mitel, and over the fact that after a short period of renewed debate in the House, the Government has decided to impose a guillotine in order to ram the Investment Canada Bill through without considering the various constructive amendments which the opposition Parties have put forward.

In listening to some of the contributions to this debate, I see some irony. I find it ironic, for example, that the Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) talks with pride about the fact that his Party intends to cut beef imports from the European Economic Community down from the level to which they have risen in order to protect the beef farmers in the country. Yet he does not understand the problems that are being created in terms of Canadian jobs due to the takeover of Mitel in his own riding. If it is important to ensure equitable treatment and fair trading environments for beef farmers, the same should be the case for workers and industries in the electronics field. In the case of Mitel we are facing the sell-off of control of a very important company in the Ottawa area. This company has contributed an enormous amount to the development of the silicone valley in the Ottawa area and to