

ing to challenge by suggesting foreign-owned corporations in Canada, and this is supported by our own studies in the House of Commons, import much more of what they need from their home countries than they do from Canadian sources.

Put simply, if a foreign company opens up a branch plant in Canada its tendency is to obtain services and goods from the parent corporation as opposed to the Canadian company that is down at the end of the block, at the other end of town or, at the other end of the province or the country. One respects that. It is keeping the cash flow within the family, but it is not necessarily in the best interests of Canadian companies, large and small.

Companies tend to discourage competition with their parent company. Again that is totally understandable. If a branch plant from an American corporation is operating in Canada, it will not want to go into the international markets and attempt to compete with a parent company. I think that is only common sense. These branch plants are here to serve this little market and this little market only. Any attempt to sell more lumber or finished products on the world market is not part of their mandate. It is not part of their *raison d'être*; it is not part of the reason for their presence in Canada. In that case, the restriction is on a foreign company operating in Canada which is not necessarily here to expand in the best interests of the Canadian economy, Canadian suppliers, Canadian exporters and the like.

One could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. I think I would choose to end my comments by quoting from the Progressive Conservative Party's own task force on high technology. In the report we find the following:

Recent data indicates that the research and development intensity of foreign subsidiaries in Canada tends to lack behind domestically-owned operations of comparable magnitude.

Perhaps I will have an opportunity to enlarge on that point this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERMEN—EXPIRATION OF BENEFITS

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, once again this year ice is blocking many of

the bays around the Island of Newfoundland and along the coast of Labrador. As in past years, fishermen, particularly inshore fishermen, are unable to get their boats out and to fish as they usually do. This has happened before; it has now happened again.

Fishermen cannot collect unemployment insurance benefits after May 15. After that time there is no income for them whatsoever. This situation has gone on and has not been corrected. I call upon the Government to correct the situation by bringing in measures to amend the regulations so that fishermen are treated on a par with other workers, and are allowed to collect unemployment insurance benefits until such time as they are able to go to work once more.

Failing that, I call upon the Government to do what has been done before, to make an *ex gratia* payment, a special allotment, for those fishermen who will have no other income after May 15, so that they will be able to feed themselves and their families until such time as the ice has gone and they are able to fish again.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES—IMPOSITION OF TRADE EMBARGO ON NICARAGUA

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, Canadians heaved a small sigh of relief yesterday at the news that we would not be going along with the American embargo on trade with Nicaragua.

President Reagan's failure to consult, or even to notify the Canadian Government, should tell us that it is very difficult to be a paranoid's best friend. President Reagan's bully-boy tactics do not even reflect the majority American opinion as expressed in the resounding House of Representative's defeat of his \$14 million program to help right-wing rebels. President Reagan's cowboy diplomacy poses a grave threat, not only to the fragile economy of Nicaragua, but also to the equally fragile stability and peace of our world.

Canada has a responsibility to tell President Reagan that we do not support his fantastic goal of overthrowing the Nicaraguan Government. Rather, we should increase our aid to the people of Nicaragua and take immediate action to widen our trade. Let us tell the people of Nicaragua that we are indeed open for business.

* * *

NATIONAL FOREST WEEK

CHOICE OF GRANDE PRAIRIE AS ALBERTA FOREST CAPITAL

Mr. Albert Cooper (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my hon. colleagues that next week is National Forest Week, making forestry the focus for many celebrations across Canada. These festivities will provide Canadians with an understanding of the resource and its benefits. It is time for