legislatively created across the land. We have a situation where the actual activity of the body that is charged to act in this area is itself so weak as to be pitiful. It is so ineffective it frankly dismays any of us who believe in future Canadian control over our economy.

I want to bring forward to the House today a series of cases we have looked at in some detail. These are cases which demonstrate very clearly the totally weak, ineffective and unacceptable record of Investment Canada with respect to the particular mandate it has. These are cases with which I have had to deal as a Member of Parliament for my region, and as the Member of Parliament responsible for monitoring Investment Canada.

Let me start with the case of a small company called Sheller-Globe of Canada Ltd. It is a small company, but in fact employed 200 workers in the constituencies of the Windsor area. It gave those workers a potential to improve the unacceptable unemployment rate in that part of the country. Those 200 workers produced steering wheels. That company was shut down recently, within the last few weeks in fact, despite the fact that when this takeover was reviewed by Investment Canada itself, commitments were made to new investment by Sheller-Globe of Canada Ltd. to increase use of Canadian parts and services and to additional exports to enhance technological development. Yet despite those commitments, this plant has simply shut down.

We finally managed to get a commitment in committee last week out of Investment Canada to investigate why it is that despite these commitments made so recently, this plant has nevertheless shut its doors and put 200 workers out on the street. I have to say that to this stage we could get absolutely no information from Investment Canada which would indicate that it had monitored whatsoever the commitments the company had made prior to the shutting of its doors in the last few weeks. The company, so far as anyone can tell, had record sales and profits. It worked at more than 100 per cent capacity, six to seven days per week, for the last two years, yet it shut down.

• (1250)

That, Mr. Speaker, is what foreign investment can be about in this country if there is not the sovereign ability of this country to be able to review, to be able to monitor, and to be able to see to it that these companies live up to the commitments that they make when they enter the country. That is one example.

A second example, and one which is equally sad, is the case of Cross-LaSalle, again, a smaller firm. Cross-LaSalle was taken over by Cross and Trecker of the United States, and Cross and Trecker again made certain commitments, commitments which it indicated to Investment Canada it would carry forward.

In this particular case, Cross and Trecker, in 1985, made commitments for new investment, for increased employment, for the increased use of Canadian parts and services, and for improved productivity and industrial efficiency.

Despite those commitments, commitments accepted by Investment Canada on June 14, 1985, this plant too shut its doors. It shut its doors in the middle of a strike, consolidating its operations in the United States and costing 40 workers in Windsor their jobs. That is the kind of record, too, which is possible with minimal monitoring by Investment Canada.

In this particular case, just this month that same firm, a firm which claimed so much poverty with respect to its operations that it had to shut down, indicated that it would be making new investments in Georgetown, Kentucky, a right-to-work state in the southern part of the United States, which would provide new jobs for 150 employees.

Once more, we have a clear indication of a lack of monitoring and a clear indication of what can happen if there is not a regime in place which permits close surveillance of foreign investors, surveillance which would ensure that they actually follow through on the commitments they make to this country when they come in here.

If we were to eliminate the commitments entirely, if we were to follow some of the suggestions made by the United States to liberalize yet further, that is, weaken yet further our foreign investment laws, we would find our position in dealing with companies such as these even more abjectly weakened.

Let me give you a third example. This one is in the publishing sector and involves Simon & Schuster. There was a takeover in this sector which my colleague will deal with in more detail, the Gulf and Western takeover of Prentice-Hall. I simply want to make the point that one of the commitments made in that particular takeover, and it was one that was trumpeted very loudly by the Government, was the commitment to see to it that Canadian authors were promoted through Simon & Schuster, the international arm of Gulf and Western.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the 1987 Simon & Schuster catalogue. The commitment was that for each year for 10 years there would be 10 Canadian authors promoted through this international arm, and yet within this catalogue we have only one Canadian author listed, and that is in relation to a cassette tape, not a book that is being promoted.

Again, we have complete ignorance with respect to the agency involved in so far as the putting into effect of the commitments that have been made. We have talked to the agency about this particular issue. We have talked to officials of the agency, and they have admitted to us that more than a year after the agreement permitting Gulf and Western to purchase Prentice-Hall they still do not have in place an agreement with Gulf and Western with respect to this particular part of the arrangement.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, with specific cases. We could talk about the Dome—Amoco deal and the vicious legal attempts on the part of Amoco to try to make it impossible for