

*Investment Canada Act*

view, be considered from a somewhat more critical viewpoint. I think there are three major consequences to the change in the screening agency as we knew it, and to the establishment of the agency known as Investment Canada.

Over the last two decades, Mr. Speaker, without exaggeration, we have experienced a significant acceleration in the interdependence of countries as involved in the global economy. Foreign trade has been a factor of growth, both for us and the others. To be a full partner in the global economy network, a nation must control its economic base, from which it will derive its strategy at the world level. And where the economic base of a nation is owned by foreign interests, that nation's power of decision at the international level is displaced and significantly reduced. Recent economic history, the oil conflict in particular, the global debt crisis, the protracted recession of the 1980's, show without a shadow of doubt that the interests of creditor nations always outweigh those of debtor nations.

Foreign control may also result in a loss of national identity. This also affects the international economic policy, especially where a nation's most sensitive sectors such as the cultural and the communications sectors, are controlled by foreign interests. But although the domestic production of certain activities may be more costly in terms of net economic costs than their importation, regulations favouring Canadians may be the only real means of checking such activity.

There are also consequences with regard to technological progress. This is my second point. As we know, Canada has been striving for a number of years for an international presence in the fields of research and development. We all know about the space arm, developed in this area, which is one of the very successfully innovative developments this country has made in the space industry.

It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the National Science Council has often stressed the point that Canada was not a great performer in that important area of research and development. We were often reminded that foreign multinationals had a tendency to concentrate their research and development activities in their own countries, and because of that they ignore the scientific potential of Canadians.

The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) pointed out this morning that in her constituency, things were different. She said: "Oh, at home, you know, CIP is a company that does a lot of research and development". I am not sure, I will check, but generally speaking most countries... CIP is a Canadian company but, as a rule, foreign companies do less research and development than Canadian companies.

All we need do is refer to Statistics Canada. My source of information is simple enough, a Statistics Canada publication entitled "Industrial Research and Development", Catalogue No. 88-202 of June 1984, the most recent. We see in the table that Canadian companies invest 1.4 per cent of their sales in research and development. American companies here in

Canada spend less than 1 per cent—.9 per cent to be precise. The same is true of other countries, and that is where the problem lies. Foreign companies are inclined to do technological research and development in their own country and import it in other countries where they have branch plants. It stands to reason that foreign companies would prefer to import their new technology and do little if any research and development here, be it in car manufacturing, high technology, space research, ordinary mechanics, engineering and so on.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that we must promote—and try to enforce, if necessary—basic respect for Canadian initiative. We are trying to make them understand that investment is welcome in Canada, and it is. But come here in the interest of Canadians, do your research here, develop new products of international quality which we can sell on world markets, and help us develop our natural resources. But do not try to buy Canada, it is not up for sale!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Questions or comments. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mrs. B. Tardif).

**Mrs. B. Tardif:** Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed to hear my colleague from Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) suggest that the government imposed closure when a bill has been considered for over 80 hours in the House and in committee and when the opposition has resorted extensively to filibuster tactics. As we know, on the second reading to which the member for Ottawa-Vanier just referred the opposition introduced a motion for a six-month hoist and rather than debating the philosophy of the bill, they carried an aimless series of discussions. When the bill was sent to committee, the opposition once again tried to delay the consideration of the bill with its numerous amending motions. In the House, we saw what the approach of the opposition was. It is somewhat surprising but we know precisely what has been the behaviour of the opposition up to now.

On the other hand, I would like to ask my colleague what he thinks about the results of a poll published on Monday last in the newspapers especially in a fine one, *Le Soleil de Québec* under the headline: "A majority for foreign investments in Canada". Two Canadian out of three hope that Prime Minister Mulroney will promote foreign investment rather than discourage it, with only 19 per cent. A small minority, that is 9 per cent, is satisfied with our present policy and an equal number are undecided.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, both questions of the Parliamentary Secretary puzzle me somewhat. In the first place, when the debate began on December 7, 1984, we had four days in the House. This is not much when we consider that the Tories held some bills for months when they were the opposition. It cannot be said that four days are too much. In January, the bill was debated for six days in committee and there were 14 sittings, two of which with the minister. This is