

loggers and the millworkers in the Lake Cowichan area would have seen that area so completely and quickly devastated, and the timber resources sold off so rapidly, if they had done the planning. If they had done the planning there would still be strong milling communities in that area, instead of communities which depend more and more upon tourism and retirees for the basic economy.

I would like to make a few comments on Motion No. 14, which requires that non-Canadian ownership and control, when it comes into Canada, must respect the rights of workers, and particularly the right of workers to collective bargaining. We believe that is essential. As one of my colleagues stated, we do not want to see the labour standards of Taiwan, Singapore or South Korea being imported into Canada and forced upon Canadians as part of the Investment Canada package. Again, it should be a responsibility of the Minister to insist that the foreign companies which come into Canada know what are the rights of the workers of this country.

Motion No. 15 states that one of the duties and powers of the Minister should be to encourage Canadian control in areas relating to our cultural heritage and national identity. We would like to see that as one of the Minister's recognized duties.

Motion No. 17 adds the words "or territory" to Clause 5 of the Bill. It requires that the Minister will not only enter into agreements with the provinces, but also that he must include the territories. I know it is commonly understood that the word "provinces" includes the territories, but we think it should be spelled out in order that the territories will not be ignored, as they are so often.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his time has expired. I will now recognize the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) on debate.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry-Prescott-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-15, and the amendments which have been proposed by my colleagues with respect to some of the worries which we have *vis-à-vis* the legislation as it presently stands.

My colleagues have spoken at some length on these amendments because we are worried about what this Government is trying to do. It wants to change the foreign investment legislation to encourage the investment of foreign capital in Canada.

Everyone is in favour of having more investment and more capital to create jobs, but that is not the issue. I know it is hard for Tories to understand this, but we, as Liberals, want to introduce amendments which will ensure that there will be good economic benefit for Canada. Furthermore, we want to ensure that the decisions which are taken are not taken in a political way by the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens).

It is our view that the staff which will be charged with the policy decisions at Investment Canada should not report directly to the Minister and be in the position in which they

Investment Canada Act

will become merely part of the Minister's personal staff. Ministers have a personal staff which is already far too large. We know that just from peeking out the window and seeing the large array of automobiles, limousines, drivers, assistants and political commissars. The last thing this Government should do is set up legislation which will enhance the personal office of the Minister, instead of having unbiased public servants playing their regular administrative roles. We want the administration of such programs to be done in a non-partisan manner.

Why do we want that? Let us recall what happened a few weeks ago in the Domtar issue. At that time, a number of Ministers were contradicting each other. Had it been left to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion, I am sure that my colleagues opposite, especially those from Quebec, realize that Domtar would not have received anything because the Minister was of the view that nothing should be done to assist Domtar. Luckily, other Cabinet Ministers had different views. Of course, that may now be changing. However, with the advent of this legislation we are giving those kinds of unilateral powers to the Minister and not to Cabinet. The Minister will be able to deny benefits or to encourage investment without restriction. Perhaps, he may do so in a biased manner, or with a purely regional perspective, and those decisions will not have the benefit of assistance from other Members of the House or Cabinet. Our Party wants these amendments to ensure that the legislation will be more accountable to the Government, and that the staff of Investment Canada will be more responsive to the Government, the House of Commons and Canadians.

During the last few months I have become increasingly worried about the situation in the textile industry. My concerns are due, in large part, to the unrestricted imports of various textile products which come into Canada. I am also concerned with the fact that textiles are not properly labelled. Certain products which have quotas imposed on them are coming into Canada under a different label. For instance, a T-shirt is called a shirt, as opposed to something else. Therefore, certain products which are tariff-exempt are entering Canada when tariffs should be imposed on them. Of course, in my constituency a great number of people are employed in the textile industry. The number is less than what it was at one time because of the difficulty in that industry.

● (1620)

The same, of course, applies to the footwear industry. On December 10, 1984, the Minister responsible for international trade wrote a letter to Monsieur l'Abbé Gérard Dion of the Canadian Textiles Labour-Management Committee. He was responding to a letter from l'Abbé Dion. The Minister said in his letter:

You will realize, of course, that there have been many priorities facing the Government since it took office in September and it is not possible to address them all simultaneously.

The Minister for International Trade (Mr. Kelleher) was telling us in December that he did not have the time to look after the textile industry and to protect Canadian jobs, yet,