

bill should go to committee as soon as possible so that it may be examined more thoroughly and amended where necessary.

The Gray report does not provide any evidence that ownership of Canadian enterprises by foreign interests works against the interests of Canadians in general or against Canada as a nation. Nor does the report provide any evidence that any benefit would accrue from the mere fact of buying control of any business or industry owned by foreign entrepreneurs who established such enterprises. This is very disappointing to me because, like most Canadians who have been subjected to a barrage of criticism and alarmist viewpoints about the danger of foreign takeovers, I should very much like to know just what is the true situation and whether or not there is in fact a danger that we will lose control of our economy.

There is not one iota of truth in the claim that we, as a nation, do not have effective control over our economy—and I will give the government and previous governments credit for this—if we take the evidence available to us, evidence that can be taken seriously. In the absence of any clear-cut evidence of control, I must accept the preponderance of opinion expressed by most of our bankers and industrialists that Canada is in control of every area of its national economy and that we are in no immediate or long-term danger of losing that control.

There is evidence that foreign-owned or controlled businesses and industries are as good corporate citizens as are Canadian-owned enterprises. There is ample evidence that without the influx of foreign capital and expertise of the past 50 years many areas of our economy would be lagging behind acceptable norms. I say that from my own business experience, because I found this to be true in the 25 years that I was in business before coming to this chamber. Our mining and smelting industry, lumber, pulp and paper and automotive industries, as well as a large percentage of our labour intensive industries were established initially, or have been since established, by capital brought in by foreign entrepreneurs. This has been the case ever since confederation. One notable example of this was the influx of British capital which, in the main, built the Canadian Pacific Railway, the very instrument of confederation.

At this point I would like to use an example that is familiar to all of us to point up the jaundiced view of many of our so-called economic nationalists. I refer to the plant operated by the Canadian International Paper Company in Temiscaming, Quebec. All of us mourn the closing of the plant, and the loss of jobs by hundreds of people in that town. Canadian International Paper Company has always been a good corporate citizen. For the past 52 years the company has spent tens of billions of dollars in capital equipment and improvements, taxes, salaries and in other ways, in fulfilling its obligations to the community, to the country and to its shareholders. It has been the town's major employer and it has been a good employer. We are now informed that the plant is being closed down because the market for the company's product has changed to the extent that the plant is no longer economically viable. Understandably, the company's workers are stunned and afraid. They are concerned

#### *Foreign Takeovers Review Act*

about their future prospects of employment, and they are concerned about their families.

Since the news of the closing of the Temiscaming plant, it has been touted around by the economic nationalists that the company's head office is in New York and that therefore the company is owned by a United States parent. This good corporate citizen has suddenly become a culprit. We are told now that this is one of the dangers of having major industries owned or controlled by outsiders, and that the company would continue in operation if it had been Canadian-owned.

We have another example of this, the case of a company well known to all of us, one of the largest in the world, and vital to Canada International Nickel of Sudbury. Although all of the physical work of mining and smelting takes place in Canada, its administrative headquarters is in New York city. I have no objection to that so long as the company remains, as it always has been, a good corporate citizen of Canada. It has a world wide market as well as world wide respect. Falconbridge is another company that also enjoys such respect.

Let us look at two fundamental facts about the operation of this company in Temiscaming. Canadian International Paper Company did not wait until the last minute before trying to take corrective action. For the past few years, the company has been seeking alternative measures to stave off the effects of a failing market for its product. It has tried to find ways of adapting the plant's facilities to production of more viable products, but could not find such a solution. Now that closing of the plant has been forced upon them, the company has arranged to assist any government agency or private interests in utilizing the plant's facilities for the production of any marketable product in an effort to minimize the impact on the local citizens. This does not indicate that industrial giants are unfeeling, or that they are not interested in the welfare and well being of the citizens of the host country.

I regret to say that Ottawa has become such a bureaucratic jungle in the four years of the present government's term of office that I shudder at the implications of this bill. The fact that a group of bureaucrats are to be put in the position of passing judgment on the acceptability of an investor in Canada and assessing such investor's net advantage or disadvantage to the Canadian economy bodes no future good. In my opinion, the part of the bill which gives all power to the minister, and then in turn to the Cabinet, is inadvisable. How in the name of reason could such people be expected to know more about a particular enterprise than those people who have spent their lives learning their industrial crafts, and who know not only the ins and outs of the business but the workings of the world markets?

• (1720)

**Mr. Pepin:** We have some businessmen, don't worry.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** I hope you do, Mr. Minister. The minister says he will have some businessmen to advise on these questions. I hope that is so, and will always be the case without exception after this bill comes into force. If this is the answer to the particular problem the government has