

hide behind the issue of jobs needed. It is more than a little inconsistent to hear government speakers tell us that we must be so concerned about the issue of jobs, yet that is what we are hearing from them. Indeed, we are not hearing a strong statement of support of the bill before the House but, rather, a continuous apology for a policy for which apologies cannot be made.

The previous speaker, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) spent most of his time suggesting alternatives. He really gave us quite a tour. It was almost like a combination of the encyclopaedia and the Canadian geographic magazine; he went all across Canada, all over the world and threw in his ideas. He seemed to forget the matter before us is government legislation which, if he is still a member of the government, he is supporting. It is just another indication of lack of support.

There is also a reflection of lack of leadership on this particular issue. Nowhere has there been any less indication of leadership than on this issue. If one wants, as some government speakers have done, to refer to the Canada Development Corporation as another part of the positives, it certainly is a part of the positive: it is establishing a new game of Crown corporation musical chairs where we, presumably, will permanently see a collection of various odds and sods of institutions, all of a governmental or quasi-governmental nature, being taken over by the CDC with absolutely no relationship to the question of economic self-determination for Canadians.

We in this party are well aware of the need to encourage development in Canada, especially in areas where economic conditions are depressed. We in this party have no hang-ups or misconceptions about a healthy attitude toward foreign investment.

**An hon. Member:** What does that mean?

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Just listen and I will get to it. Where we differ and find cause to belittle this bill and its child's step, instead of what should be a mature solution, is in the complete reluctance to realize the firm need for some very clearly stated guidelines on foreign investment and Canadian development for this country. I find it passing strange for the government, with a straight face, to produce a report such as was presented to this House a few short weeks ago and then follow it up with this kind of bizarre piece of legislation that the minister spoke of this afternoon.

**Mr. Pepin:** You have already said that three times.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Maybe it needs to be said more often if the message has not reached the minister's ears. Presumably that is one of the points of debate.

**Mr. Pepin:** I am waiting for ideas.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** There will be plenty. I hope the minister took note of those that were presented today. I am sure he did. There must be some understanding of what the government's role will be with respect to investment generally. There is no indication whatsoever of what the government has in mind. Indeed, all we are getting from this government in the matter of investment is a conflicting signal.

#### *Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

The greatest enterprises which involve the largest number of Canadians must be shaking their heads in vain about what the government is really up to with regard to the Canadianization of economic activity. I am referring to the activities that took place last fall with regard to the taxation of co-operatives and credit unions. Both inside and outside this chamber we witnessed hamhanded attempts to limit the effectiveness of the most Canadian institutions that we have. It was only after considerable pressure that the government finally and reluctantly reverted to the previous legislative situation which in effect provided an effective framework for co-operatives and credit unions to flourish in this country. What could be more important to the future development of Canadian involvement and control of commercial activities than these two very important enterprises?

Since it has reached ten o'clock I will not take up any more time this evening. However, I will present some concrete suggestions tomorrow afternoon and I hope the minister will be in the chamber to hear them and respond. May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

#### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

#### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—BANGLADESH—ESTABLISHMENT OF FACILITIES IN DACCA FOR CANADIAN PLENIPOTENTIARY

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) the following question:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question. Inasmuch as the distinguished High Commissioner for Bangladesh has arrived in Ottawa, can the minister report on whether or not facilities have been acquired in Dacca for the Canadian plenipotentiary to perform his duties, and when that official will in fact be performing his duties in Dacca?

• (2200)

The reply was:

Mr. Speaker, I shall have to take the question as notice. I am not certain whether our new High Commissioner has yet appeared in Dacca. As the hon. member knows, there is a double accreditation to this post.

I may say I have had no further response to this question which the minister took as notice. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I was aware of the fact that the chief Canadian representative to Dacca had accreditation at another capital. It was this very situation which I protested a good many weeks ago.

This situation is doubtless another aspect of the withdrawal syndrome reflected in the government's white paper on foreign policy. There are in Ottawa today representatives of ten countries at whose capitals Canada has no accredited plenipotentiary. The House will have heard me make frequent mention of the little Commonwealth country of Barbados which has had a fine mission here in