

The Address—Mr. Whelan

Austro-Hungarian empire from where he came. He hardly ever used his trade in Canada to make a living because there were just no jobs available in that line. As I say, he became a very successful farmer.

Needless to say, he well remembered his first nine years in Canada, right back to the first one, and he also remembered who was in power. Needless to say, he was something like the former leader of the good old Tory party, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield)—he is sitting in the House at the present time. The hon. gentleman made a speech I well remember—it wasn't according to his written text, but that is a lot like the speeches the Minister of Agriculture makes; all it says on the top of my brief is "Notes for a Speech".

As I mentioned, the former leader of the Conservative party made a speech, and the heading which was placed over the press report of that speech was "The Good Old Days". He went right back to the first world war, all through the twenties, all through the thirties and into the terrible second world war. And the notable part of it was, he said the good old days really started after the war. He talked about the days when there was no unemployment insurance, when there was no hospitalization program, when there was no medicare, when there were none of these programs which look after the unfortunate in our society. Then the hon. member went into the years after the last terrible war and described how these social programs had come about. Those were what he called the good old days.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halifax was quite sincere when he talked about the good old days. He was recognizing that the good old days took place in this century. He was also recognizing which party was in power and had the most to do with those good old days, not the bad old days he had been talking about before.

I just put some of these thoughts on the record when we talk about unity, when we talk about economics. When I hear what some people are saying about the economics of the country and about the conditions of its industry, and the future of this country, I am reminded of something which happened in my constituency. There was a man went there by the name of Roy Bennett, president of the Ford Motor Company of Canada. I am not going to read the whole of the speech he made but I will put part of what he had to say on the record. He was speaking at a sod turning ceremony for the new plant in Canada. Among other things, he said:

Interestingly, it was the prime minister at the time when Ford started operations in Windsor, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who presently holds that distinction.

He was talking about the prime minister who served the longest term of office in Canada, and who still holds that record. And we know that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a Liberal, too. I thought it was unique in some respects, because here is the Ford Motor Company making an investment of \$550 million, the largest investment the company has ever made outside its operations in the United States of America, the largest it has ever made in Canada since its beginning 75 years ago.

Not very far away from them we find General Motors investing over \$400 million, and again not very far away,

[Mr. Whelan.]

Maple Leaf-Unilever investing \$96 million. Right next door to them United Co-operatives of Ontario is investing \$22 million. A few miles to the east Labatt-Redpath is investing over \$140 million. Ciba-Geigy is investing nearly \$2 million right next to my area. I could go on and mention others who are investing large amounts of money at the present time in southwestern Ontario.

● (1252)

I hear the economic pygmies talk about gloom and doom in this country. Does Ford Motor Company not have economic advisers? Ford has the best advisers money can buy. General Motors has the best economic advisers money can buy. So does Maple Leaf-Unilever. Do UCO and Labatt-Redpath, not have the best economic advisers money can buy? Are the economic advisers they have stupid or ignorant? Do they lack the ability to advise the directors of those companies that they should be investing money in Canada at this time? We know they have the best economic advisers. Their advisers are living in 1978, 1979, and into the future. That is why they are telling their companies that the best place in which to invest their money is Canada. Many other people are telling them the same thing, but some hon. members opposite would try to put into people's minds the idea that Canada is a terrible place to be in and that it is terribly mismanaged economically. That message is certainly not getting through to Ford, General Motors, or Maple Leaf-Unilever. Unilever is one of the largest corporations in the world. Labatt-Redpath and Ciba-Geigy, another world company, are investing in Canada because they realize that Canada has the greatest of everything. No matter what anyone wants to say, our standard of living is second to none in the world. Our way of life is second to none in the world.

An hon. Member: Oh?

Mr. Whelan: Our opportunities are second to none in the world.

An hon. Member: Our government?

Mr. Whelan: I hear some noises opposite. I have a brother out in Saskatchewan. People talk about unity. Some wish that we could all be like Alberta. Alberta is a great "unifying" province which is piling up billions of dollars. I am sure we will get Peter to share that. I hope the former mayor of Toronto will get Peter to share his heritage fund with the rest of Canadians. Peter says he is a good Canadian, but \$4 billion are being piled up year after year, and that causes some problem in a country which calls itself federal and which has a federal constitution bringing together many provinces.

The politicians of 1930 made a very serious mistake. Do hon. members want me to remind them who those politicians were? They handed over the resources of this country to the provinces. In a certain province people are being told that they will not have any taxes to pay in a few years. That part of the country will still be called Canada. A Canadian on one side of an invisible provincial boundary will have to pay taxes because his province does not have the resources which can be found on the other side. Those resources were certainly not put there by the former premier of Saskatchewan, even though he might like to think he had something to do with their creation. He