

● (1732)

When a Canadian company such as MacMillan Bloedel goes abroad it brings benefit to Canada in the form of the share dividends that accrue to Canadian shareholders. The role of the Export Development Corporation in setting up these corporations abroad is to create jobs and bring other benefits such as the flow of capital to Canadians.

If my friends in the opposition do not agree with that thesis that projects will go ahead with or without our participation, if they wish Japanese, West German or United Kingdom companies to straddle the world while ours remain at home, let them say so. Let the Japanese, the West German and United Kingdom companies develop mines in Indonesia and Guatemala. Let them surround us with their capital while we stay pure and do not put money into industries that may compete against us.

The argument put forth by some hon. members is fallacious. If we are to provide stimulus to Canadian business so that they can compete abroad in countries using exactly the same type of corporation—some with lower interest rates than ours—then we must support this legislation. If we take the view that such competition does not matter—that because Alcan or any other company has interests in Canada and therefore we should not compete against ourselves—we should say so.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt will have an opportunity to contribute to this debate later, although judging from his past performance he will not have much to contribute.

I hope that members who have an interest in this corporation will express their views at committee stage when they will be able to examine witnesses, including the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and his officials. I hope we get speedy passage of this bill to the committee stage.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The parliamentary secretary said he would answer a question at the end of his speech, so I presume he is now prepared to do so.

I have information from International Nickel Company of Canada in a letter signed by Elizabeth Parr Bond, the director of government affairs. The question is related to the hon. member's reference to the number of man-years of employment that would be created. The letter says quite clearly that the EDC has estimated their loans to Inco have provided the equivalent of 4,000 man-years of work for Canadians through contracts to about 490 Canadian suppliers. This relates to the \$77 million that EDC loaned to Inco for the Indonesia operation and the Guatemala operation which it claims created 4,000 man-years of employment. How does the hon. member reconcile 4,000 man-years of employment with the loss of 4,000 permanent jobs at Inco in Sudbury, Thompson, and Port Colborne?

Mr. Anderson: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I did not think much would come from the hon. member. I am not sure if this is allowed but I should like to ask him how many tons of nickel are being produced in Guatemala or Indonesia today, April 26, in competition with Inco mines in Canada. I suspect the

Export Development Act

answer is zero. I also suspect the hon. member did not listen to a word I said. The mines in Guatemala and Indonesia would have been developed with U.K., German and Japanese capital, regardless of what Inco did or of EDC involvement.

The hon. member should ask himself if he would be satisfied with no jobs being created in Canada through the development of those mines when the work could have gone to any other country, or is he happy with the 4,000 man-years of work created in Canada? We could have ended up with no jobs but still had the competition. Now at least we have the 4,000 man-years of work, although we know there will be competition at some future date from mines throughout the world that do not have any Canadian participation. He makes a rather foolish argument, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Could I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? The hon. member used the example that I presume was provided for him of the Whitby firm Co'steel International Ltd. which has established a plant in New Jersey, and pointed out, quite rightly, that it has been given a large amount of assistance to enable it to buy from Canadian manufacturers. This is a one-time grant, of course.

Could the hon. member tell me what we are doing wrong? Surely the money we loaned would produce permanent jobs in Canada, not just jobs on a one-shot basis. Could the material not be manufactured in Canada? Are tariffs too high or our prices too high? What could we have done to keep that corporation in Canada so that the jobs could be permanent jobs?

Surely the function of EDC is to work toward that end and not just on one-time projects that give a certain number of man-years of work but from which there is no lasting benefit. Presumably the suppliers who benefit at this stage expect to exist afterwards, but this type of operation makes their future precarious, to say the least. Is there not something more that the EDC could have done so that this Canadian plant could have located in the maritimes where it was going to locate had not some inducements been offered which persuaded it to establish in New Jersey?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. For the information of hon. members, I did not recognize the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) on a point of order for the purpose of asking a question. Perhaps we could clarify that at this time. He may not be recognized in the debate again if there is not unanimous consent that he was recognized for the purpose of asking a question. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a very good and rational question. Unfortunately the decision was made by the company in Whitby to locate its mill in New Jersey. I cannot comment on the reasons for the decision. I suspect, however, that the location is closer to the market it intends to serve. I am sure the hon. member heard me say the company has branches in the United Kingdom. I suspect it located in New Jersey to serve a regional market from Maine