

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon), asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) today how it benefits the Canadian jobless to make available to those who would invest the opportunity to take over an existing company, integrate its operations into the present operation and simply hang on to the distribution system, then close down the manufacturing operation in Canada. How does that benefit the Canadian jobless? The answer is clear, it does not. And there are countless examples where that has occurred. Even with FIRA, that has occurred. If the Government were truly interested in trying to provide for Canadian needs, it would not eliminate FIRA but would look for ways to improve it. That is the direction in which we ought to be going.

How many new jobs are created when a company decides, as did United Technologies, to take over a viable operation in Canada, Otis Elevator, as part of its world-wide conglomerate operation, and then systematically to reduce its involvement in Canada at the manufacturing level? In the recent past, Otis Elevator was providing elevators, escalators, and all kinds of hoisting equipment all around the world. This equipment is now being provided out of New Jersey or out of Germany instead of out of Hamilton or Toronto. Where is the benefit from allowing that kind of take-over?

The Prime Minister says we are trying to create jobs. There were no jobs created there. That is an example of the kinds of major conglomerate operations which this Government is now trying on bended knee to convince to bring their money to Canada. For what? They buy the company, run it down and then take advantage of the already developed customer network by selling to that customer network from their existing operations elsewhere. They then have the nerve to write off their losses against their tax payable in Canada. The Canadian taxpayer not only does not end up with jobs, expertise or research and development, but ends up paying for the loss of these things.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what is wrong with the approach of this Government. It does not seem to take a critical view of the real world. I would like to see investment in Canada so that people have jobs. I want to see research and development taking place here. I want opportunities for our young people who are coming out of the universities and colleges to find jobs in high technology fields. I want to find in Canada the will to develop an indigenous and unique Canadian process which will make Canada first in the world. However, we will not get that in a country like this unless we require from those who are going to establish their operations here that they set out a program and make a commitment to the country as a whole. They have to talk about having Canadians running the operations and developing a research and development component indigenous to this country. They have to give a world mandate for certain product lines that they will develop here. You do not get those kinds of things unless you ask for them. You cannot guarantee they will be in place unless you have it in a contract. Even then it is difficult to try to enforce it. But it is at least possible to measure it, enforceable or otherwise. You can say to them: "You told us you would do this thing". They

in turn may well be prepared to sit down and consider whether or not a commitment is something they have to live up to. But as the Minister talks about it, this is not the kind of thing we are going to see.

● (1540)

We hear Canada is open for business again. I predict those famous words will come back to haunt the Prime Minister. As I listened to what he was saying and looked at his objectives and desires over and against past performance, I could not help thinking that Canada is going to get the business again. That is how it seemed to me. There is no way, under this new legislation, to ensure that the kind of development we get is going to be in our long-term best interests. As my colleague said earlier, it is not as if we do not have any foreign investment. Can you imagine the debate in the U.S. Congress and Senate if 52 per cent to 53 per cent of all U.S. manufacturing and industrial component were owned by Canadians? Could you picture it? Could you imagine the debate if 52 per cent to 53 per cent of all U.S. industry and commerce were owned by the Japanese, the Europeans or someone in Hong Kong? It would never tolerate it. It would never accept it. It would be moving—I beg your pardon?

Mr. Friesen: It used to be owned by the British Government.

Mr. Deans: And it changed it.

Mr. Langdon: A revolution.

Mr. Deans: But the United States would never tolerate it. You know that as well as I do, Mr. Speaker; I can tell from the look in your eye that you agree with my every word. If this debate were taking place in the U.S. Congress, the seats would be filled. Every Congressman would be rising to defend American interests. Every single Congressman would be speaking on behalf of the necessity to develop an economy in the region he represents, an economy primarily owned, controlled, operated and directed by Americans.

Mr. Jepson: Stratford is calling.

Mr. Deans: My colleague says that Stratford is calling. Do you know what is wrong? The trouble is that my colleague seems unable to separate the presentation from the substance.

Mr. Jepson: Theatrics from the—

Mr. Deans: The substance, I want to say to him, is of infinite value, whether he knows it or not. In time to come he will look back and regret the fact that when the opportunity was given to him to rise and speak he did not take it. It is absolutely essential in this House at this time that the Members of Parliament get up off their backsides and speak for Canada. They have to understand that what we are talking about is not some passing phase. This is not just a matter of saying, "Well, two or three weeks from now things will be okay and we will all get back to normal". What the Government is doing is making a fundamental decision about who is