

preneurs is those with bucks, not necessarily those with ideas. In committee we have heard about the reality of Canada. I would like to quote from a presentation of an old seatmate of mine, Dr. Stuart Smith, the head of the Science Council of Canada. He stated:

The missing link is that as individual Canadians and as Canadian institutions we have developed habits of investment which are not appropriate to the rapidly changing international picture. We have developed, over the years, a reliance upon our resource sector to carry us through and a feeling that we could basically ignore the export markets for knowledge-intensive goods, high value-added goods. We have left those either to foreign companies who have not entered the export market because they basically did that from their home enterprise, or we have just ignored them completely and continued to produce very standard products in textiles, furniture and gloves. Generally speaking, we have not been in precision machinery or advanced robotics or any of these things. Now if you say, does that mean we have enough Canadian capital? Well, yes and no; yes, we have enough Canadian savings, but it is not being turned into capital in the sense that it is capital in a given industry.

Investment Canada is a fine name for this Bill. We should be using this Bill as a tool to convince Canadians to invest their savings in new growth industries such as software, electronics and robotics. We should not be spending our time trying to drag in money from outside our borders. Investment Canada should be required to study all proposals to sell existing Canadian companies to foreigners and then to go on a search for capital.

When a company wants to hire someone from outside our borders, they are first required to do a job search. They must go through Canada Employment and Immigration and search from sea to sea to discover if there is a Canadian who is qualified to do that job. In the majority of cases they find a Canadian who is qualified and prepared to relocate for the purpose of achieving gainful employment.

I suggest that Investment Canada should do the same thing. Canadian companies which wish to obtain foreign capital should be required to do a capital search from sea to sea to discover if there is money which is currently sitting in a bank account that could be better used in the production of new wealth and new jobs. That is the approach which the Government should be taking.

There will be times when it will be necessary to bring money in from beyond our borders. We must do that in a very controlled way. We must ensure that that capital is used for the benefit of Canadians. It does not do our society any good when someone buys a plant, perhaps using our money to finance it, and does not create any new wealth or new jobs. Rather, they set the plant up for the day when the parent company, in the time of recession, pulls back its horns and circles the wagons, so to speak. The plant in Canada is the first victim. We saw very clear examples of that in the mid to late 1970s throughout this land, particularly in Ontario. This Bill is trying to turn the clock back instead of trying to develop a mechanism that will allow Canadians to invest in Canada to bring about growth and development of new jobs and new wealth.

Another concern which is addressed by one of the amendments is that all Canadian businesses which are owned and controlled by non-Canadians must respect the rights of the

workers for collective bargaining. In the pulp and paper industry in Canada we are now facing very harsh competition from the southern United States. In those southern United States they have so-called "right to work" laws which basically means the right to have an unorganized, non-union facility which pays bottom of the barrel dollars. We have such companies investing in the pulp and paper industry in northwestern Ontario and their record is very dismal. If these companies are going to invest in Canada they must work by our rules. They must follow the accepted approach to worker-owner operations that we have built up over the years in Canada. Unless we put those rules in place, not only will we allow non-Canadians to buy us out, but they will severely lower our standards of living and the rights of workers on the job.

● (1140)

I believe the amendments before us are extremely important because they attempt to make a bad Bill slightly better. Although we would like to see this Bill withdrawn completely, we urge the Government to consider these motions seriously and incorporate them into the Bill.

[Translation]

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): Mr. Speaker, we are now in the last stages of the debate on Bill C-15, the legislation being proposed to replace the former Foreign Investment Review Act. Throughout the debate on this Bill, at the second reading stage and in committee, we have been urging the Government to reconsider its approach to establishing a form of control over foreign investment in Canada.

Despite their efforts both at the second reading stage and in committee, up to now the Official Opposition and the opposition represented by the New Democratic Party have been unable to persuade the Government to modify its general approach.

Now, at the report stage, we have a chance to modify the content of certain clauses of the Bill. Among the proposals that were made, Mr. Speaker, I shall, if I may, consider three of the motions, namely, Motions Nos. 4, 6 and 16. I intend to deal simultaneously with Motions 4 and 16 which concern the powers granted the Minister under the proposed legislation.

The attitude taken by the Government, and especially by the Minister responsible for Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens) is, I think, an extremely arrogant one. The Minister is empire building. He wants to keep the decision-making power to himself. However, we believe, and that is the objective of Motion No. 4, that a distinction must be made between setting policy and policy implementation.

If Bill C-15 . . . Government Members will realize later on, when they are facing specific problems related to take-overs in their own ridings, they will see how what I am going to say will affect them and maybe, in a couple of years, they will say: Maybe we should have listened a bit more: it might have been a good idea.