

*Investment Canada Act*

you the elongated guns they had to buy from the Hudson's Bay Company, which sold the guns in return for a number of furs piled up to the height of the gun barrel. That is the kind of price Indian people had to pay to gain access to technology. The European trading companies recognized very clearly that the control of technology was equivalent to control of the economy and, indeed, of society as a whole.

We now face a similar explosion of technology, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that there is not a single Member of this House or any legislature in the world with a complete understanding of the implications of all the technological changes taking place in our world today. Things are happening at a very rapid rate and we have trouble just keeping up. The use of new technology in our offices, for example, can help us in many ways, but we have to be trained to use it and it is again a question of who controls technology. Indeed, there are implications in these developments which even the people doing the developing do not understand.

On that basis I think it is very important that this House recognize that Canada should have some control over the way in which new technology is introduced. We should be asking questions when it is brought in. What are the implications for jobs? What are the implications for the environment? All last week and the week before we were very concerned about the question of the PCB spill. This resulted from a technology introduced some years ago, before we had any real understanding of what its implications were. Then, when we began to understand the implications, PCBs came under stricter control. But we still do not have the technology to dispose of them in a way that is satisfactory to everyone.

To conclude, the Canadian people want control over their economy and over their lives. Therefore, it is important for the federal Government to establish basic ground rules for the introduction of new technology, and that is what we seek to do with this amendment.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak again on this Bill in support of the amendment we have put forward. As I said before in addressing this same Bill, it is basically a public relations Bill. It reminds me of the preacher who wrote in the margin of his sermon: "Argument weak, pound the pulpit". The Government is pounding the pulpit, but there is not much in the Bill in terms of effective policy.

The Bill assumes that you need to encourage U.S. investment and that investment was not being made here before. That is not the case. If you have read *The Globe and Mail* for the last six or seven years, you will see that 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the applications to FIRA were approved. The United States was investing here. I want to say, though, that not all of that investment was to our advantage. For example, we have the case of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, a large multi-national based in the U.S. which had invested in Canada to develop iron ore for shipment to a number of countries but primarily to the U.S. But when times got tough, those operations were closed down. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has personal knowledge of that from what happened in Scheff-

erville, and I have personal knowledge resulting from the 50 per cent reduction of the labour force in Labrador City. I know the pain which resulted for people who thought their jobs were secure, people with homes and cars and so on, but then suddenly the axe fell. That is the down side of American investment.

The point I am making is that we have to be very careful about simply saying willy-nilly that all American investment, or, indeed, investment from any other country, is good for Canada. In my own province, we had investment from Britain in Corner Brook. But when times got tough, Corner Brook was at the end of the Bowater chain; this mill, which they had not bothered to maintain or modernize, was the one that was cut. Again we saw the pain created as a result of foreign investors failing to maintain their investment and failing to modernize. So you have to be very careful of foreign investment; it is not enough simply to change the name of a Canadian administrative body and then assume that all will be well. What protection will be built in for Canadians and Canadian companies? What would happen to small fish companies in Newfoundland if we had American investment such as we had in Labrador City, or if we had British investment such as we had in Corner Brook? What would happen if we had that kind of investment in small Newfoundland fish companies which have been struggling during the period of recession but keeping their heads above the water and doing well when larger companies have been going bankrupt? What protection do those companies have if they are open to investment by American companies? The Government must spell out very clearly what protection there will be for Canadian companies.

● (1140)

The other thing which bothers me about this particular measure is that it does not indicate how the Government will address investment in various regions of Canada. Canada is a country of different parts, not all of which are the same. Some areas of Canada need help a lot more than others. I happen to represent an area which I believe needs financial support at the present time as do all of the Atlantic provinces. There are other areas of Canada which require that particular support as well. There is nothing to say that investment which comes into Canada will be directed to a certain area of the country which needs it more than other areas. There is no policy to set out how foreign companies will be encouraged to invest in certain areas of Canada. I think the Government should address such a policy.

Even in the United States there is difficulty at the present time in encouraging investment in certain parts of the country. It is well known that there are certain areas in the U.S., such as the north-east, which are having great difficulties at the present time. Other areas, such as the south-west, are lucrative boom areas which are enticing investment. In Canada too there are areas with greater needs than others. I would like the Government to indicate how foreign and Canadian investment will be targeted to the areas of the country which need it most.