

Foreign Takeovers Review Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motions stands deferred.

Motion No. 4, moved by Mr. Fairweather and seconded by Mr. Hales, is as follows:

That Bill C-201, an act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 27 on page 2 thereof and substituting therefor the following:

"dustries in Canada;

(e) the compatibility of the acquisition with national industrial and economic policies; and

(f) after consultation by the minister with each province that is likely to be significantly affected by an assessment made by him pursuant to section 6, the effect of the acquisition on the industrial and economic policies of each such province.

Motion No. 18, moved by Mr. Saltsman and seconded by Mr. Knowles, is as follows:

That Bill C-201, an act to provide for the review and assessment of acquisitions of control of Canadian business enterprises by certain persons, be amended by renumbering present clause 6 as clause "6(1)" and adding the following immediately thereafter:

"(2) In conducting a review the minister shall consult with the appointed representative of the province or provinces concerned with the proposed acquisition."

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, surely obstruction cannot be charged, with only three minutes to go! The purpose of my amendment is to add another factor to the series of tests that the minister must apply in judging whether a proposed takeover is of significant benefit to Canada. I hope that members will quickly see the point of the suggestion which I make. The provincial realities, and I think it is right to say provincial priorities, will be a significant aspect. It is difficult when the minister uses the word "factor", because now that word will take on a very special meaning of jurisprudence, so I shall have to stop using it and start using the word "aspect" for the purpose of making a general comment.

My amendment recognizes the fact of provincial realities and priorities. I sincerely believe that it improves the bill and I have the temerity to hope that the government will accept it. I do not have any pride of ownership, and if the minister wants to make it his own, or the parliamentary secretary or the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan), I will bow out and make way for them.

With great good sense, an editorial in the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* of June 26 reads:

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger).]

Provinces have rights too:

The federal government should think twice about its decision that it cannot accommodate requests by provincial governments for more formal consultation when Ottawa is deciding whether to approve foreign takeovers.

The flat rejection of provincial participation in the decision-making process, spelled out in the commons by industry minister Jean-Luc Pepin, discriminates against the rights of the provinces and affords them precious little protection against further discrimination in the manner in which federal authority may be influenced.

Where, for instance, does unilateral approval by the federal government leave a province such as Nova Scotia in respect of a foreign takeover of a company in this province which the government of Nova Scotia considers not to be in best interests of its people?

That is why I am delighted that the minister sees the point and will add my amendment to his list of "factors".

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

PUBLIC SERVICE—REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF PETITION OF HERMAN WEISZ ALLEGING INJUSTICE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, on June 6, I presented in this House, in accordance with Standing Order 67, a petition by one Dr. Herman Weisz of Ottawa which sets out a grievance in respect of a report entitled "Concentration in the manufacturing industries of Canada". On June 7 the Clerk of the House laid upon the table the report of the Clerk of Petitions which was that this petition met the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form. On the same day the Speaker gave a ruling that the petition was not an appropriate manner in which to bring the matter to the attention of the House. This ruling said, in effect, that petitions to the House have become obsolete.

I regret this ruling in light of the long-standing right of citizens to present petitions to this House, and I hope that the appropriate committee of the House will investigate ways and means of reviewing this ancient and healthy institution so that the petitions of citizens, proper in form, may be referred by the consent of the House to appropriate committees for investigation and remedy. The Speaker did suggest that other remedies existed for those who had grievances against the administration. I now avail myself of one of these remedies.

On June 7, I questioned the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on the matter, seeking a statement from him or from the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Andras) in regard to the serious injustice alleged by Dr. Herman Weisz. No such statement has been forthcoming.

• (2200)

The grievance, Mr. Speaker, can be briefly and simply stated. It is that Dr. Herman Weisz, a Canadian citizen and a public servant, spent nearly two years, from February,