

order and the letter already referred to, which is in the Archives according to the references made, should properly be tabled. There is nothing which prevents a document from being tabled more than once, if I can put it that way.

**Mr. Beatty:** It is in the mail and we will have it to you by July.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people of Canada who are watching this whole process are sitting spell-bound in front of their television sets, wondering how Parliament works.

I take great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in tabling for the second time a document which purports to be a copy of a four-page letter dated April 28, 1980. It is from the Prime Minister of the day to the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, now of another address, and I hope it will satisfy the curiosity of the Official Opposition.

\* \* \*

## INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Stevens that Bill C-15, an Act respecting investment in Canada, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, this may be a hard act to follow.

I rise to end the debate on Bill C-15, third reading of the Investment Canada legislation, and I do so with regret. I think this will be a day that will go down in history as the start of at least an uncontrolled sell-out of this country. The principle of the Bill is not whether there should be foreign investment, but how foreign investment shall come into this country. Shall there be some kind of control? Shall there be a mechanism to ensure that whatever dollars are brought in to create wealth, it is done for the benefit of Canadians?

I want to start by giving you and this House, Mr. Speaker, an example of the negative side of uncontrolled foreign investment. A number of us in this House spent many hours this morning learning about the impact of one such foreign company on the livelihood and lifestyle of some Canadians. I am speaking of the foreign owned company Reed Paper. That company came to Dryden, Ontario, purchased a mill and extracted what it could from the forests. It did not reinvest in the mill but it did dump 20 tonnes of mercury into the English-Wabagoon River system. This legislation once again opens the doors and removes the controls which would prevent this kind of thing from happening again. These companies have as their prime motivation the extraction of profits from our country. They do not come in here with goodwill and good faith to help a community. They come in here solely for how much money they can make and take back to their shareholders.

### *Investment Canada Act*

It is this kind of attitude that we are concerned about. That is why we want legislation which will provide effective control. We do not want to say that investment cannot come in, but we want to be able to say, "Here are our rules and here is what you must do in our country. You must provide job guarantees. You must meet our environmental laws and regulations. You must protect the communities you invest in. You must not arbitrarily decide to close your company because you want to regroup in your home country". We saw so much of that in the Province of Ontario a number of years ago. We heard about the legacy of those kinds of decisions this morning. We heard how we as a society contributed to allowing a company to destroy the livelihood of two native bands in northwestern Ontario. They were self-sufficient. They had full employment. They were not on welfare. But today, as a result of the decisions by that company, 80 per cent of those people are on welfare. Disease and alcoholism is rampant. It is a shame what we have allowed to occur in the name of foreign investment and *laissez-faire*. We must ensure that we learn from the past for a change. Let us not open the doors again. Let us ensure that we have a say in what happens, in how money is spent for the betterment of society as a whole.

● (1640)

I compliment my colleagues who put forth many amendments on this legislation in an attempt to make this Bill somewhat better. Admittedly, some of the amendments were an attempt to reverse the direction of the Bill. We need to work within Canada to create a climate that will encourage people to invest at home. This week we heard from one of the major employers in my riding as well as in the ridings of my colleagues the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Nipigon (Mr. Epp) and the Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Parry), with regard to the company's attitude toward Canada. It indicated clearly that it did not have the confidence necessary to invest in Canada. It is going to the United States because its partners in the United States did not have the confidence in Canada to invest here. Changing the rules will not mean that more dollars will flow in. Something else must happen.

A report on entrepreneurs was tabled in the House yesterday. The Government is trying to bring money in from foreign lands by allowing immigration on the basis of worth and willingness to invest. The Government defines an entrepreneur as someone with money rather than someone with an idea who will work hard and create wealth. The Conservatives have taken the same approach as they have accused the Liberal Government and the NDP of wanting to take, that is, to throw money at a problem. The only difference is that they accuse us of wanting to throw public money whereas they want to throw private money. They do not want a strategy for the investment of money to create jobs and wealth.

**Mr. St. Germain:** There is no public money left. We're broke.

**Mr. Angus:** I grant that in terms of the current state of the Treasury there may be some shortfalls. However, if we started to ensure that the oil companies and multinationals paid their