

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, April 25, 1985

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Wednesday, April 24, consideration of Bill C-15, an Act respecting investment in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development; and Motions No. 1 (Mr. Axworthy) and No. 2 (Mr. Langdon) (p. 4001).

Mr. Speaker: As I indicated to the House on Tuesday last in my preliminary statement on the motions standing on the Notice Paper at the report stage of this Bill, I am now prepared to hear Hon. Members on any procedural arguments that they may wish to make with regard to those motions that I indicated gave the Chair some procedural concern.

May I ask Hon. Members when they present their arguments on any one motion or group of motions that they indicate by the motion number or numbers to which motions they are speaking. Hopefully this will make for a more orderly presentation. I recognize the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon) on Motion No. 3.

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, had you intended to consider these motion by motion or for us to comment on your set of rulings as a whole?

Mr. Speaker: I had intended to recognize all Members who wish to comment on all of the procedural issues. It is my hope that every Member who does so will indicate to which motion their comments apply. I was only beginning with the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor because his motion is first on the list of those that cause a procedural problem.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, since it would affect the way in which we proceed, perhaps you could clarify whether you want us to proceed by the rulings that you have made on motions or whether we speak to it as a whole. If so, I suggest that if we are to speak to the entire set of rulings, as the Official Opposition we should be given the opportunity to present our case first.

Mr. Speaker: I suspect that that is acceptable. I am in the hands of the House on this matter. I thought it might be easier

to let all those who wish to speak do so rather than go through it *seriatim*. However, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) on the procedural question.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg-Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the beginning of debate at report stage, we appreciate very much the time that the Speaker and the Clerk's Table have taken to try to organize some of these very complex amendments that were presented. We want to express our view that in large part we agree with many of the groupings that you have presented to the House. However, we would like to state that the amendments which we presented were in no way attempting substantially to alter or redefine the Bill but were presented in a spirit of constructive assessment and interest in improving a Bill which is a very critical piece of economic legislation and perhaps the most critical that has appeared before this Chamber during this session.

While we were pleased with many of the rulings, we would like to take issue with some of the comments on admissibility because we feel that the amendments we have presented fully meet the spirit that is contained in the Bill and the spirit by which the Speaker has tried to redefine the way in which the debate during report stage would proceed.

Although Motion No. 3 is an NDP motion, in the interest of good debate perhaps I may comment that I believe there is a way in which the admissibility of that motion could be honoured. I simply mention it because I know that the critic for the NDP will be speaking to procedural matters. I would only suggest that if an amendment to their motion would read something like as follows, "To seek the most positive performance in the interest of Canadians of past investment by non-Canadians", I think it would meet the test of admissibility very clearly. Therefore we would be able to debate what I believe would be a very useful area of discussion in the House. I only offer that as a comment, perhaps more for registry by the critic for the NDP and you, Mr. Speaker.

We have some serious concerns with respect to Motion No. 26. The inclusion of this item under the exemptions is really in keeping with a number of other parts of the Bill and already accepted in principle.

● (1110)

The purpose of the amendment is simply to add a further exemption which we would call industries of strategic importance. I would simply point out that the Bill itself, particularly if you go to Clause 48, contains references to the Bank Act which prohibits investment beyond a certain point in the banking area. Similarly, Clause 10(h) of Bill C-15 exempts from review any transaction to which Section 307 of the Bank