

Investment Canada Act

second reading. Again, the authority is Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773(5).

I would now like to turn to Motion No. 14 which seems to go beyond the scope of the Bill as well. The amendment, if adopted, would in my view, greatly expand the powers of the Minister well beyond those contemplated in the Bill. If accepted, this amendment would in my submission, call on the Minister to exercise powers which do not fall within his jurisdiction and may indeed infringe upon provincial labour jurisdictions. Furthermore, this motion is redundant inasmuch as it calls for the Minister to ensure that employers respect bargaining rights of workers whose rights are at present amply protected by the Charter of Rights, the Canadian Labour Code and provincial labour legislation.

I submit that Motion No. 14 is irrelevant to the Bill and beyond its scope and ought to be inadmissible if we are to continue the practice amply outlined in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 773(1), which reads:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the bill, beyond its scope or governed by or dependent upon amendments already negated.

Therein ends the lesson, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: First, may I thank Hon. Members for their enlightened arguments. May I also get myself into deep trouble by congratulating all three intervenors on the quality of their arguments and suggest that procedural arguments are perhaps the most limiting and difficult arguments to make in the House and I was very impressed.

Obviously, the Chair will take the time to examine these arguments and come back to the House at a later date with a definitive ruling. For the moment, debate will resume on Motions Nos. 1 and 2 now before the House.

Hon. Douglas C. Frith (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I would note with some satisfaction that this Bill has received the usual attention given to a Bill at committee stage. I want to make it perfectly clear at the onset of my intervention that we as an opposition are not opposing this Bill for the sake of opposing. We feel very strongly that some important measures are not in this Bill. We hope that the Government will listen carefully to the debate that will take place at this stage of the Bill and will agree to the inclusion of some amendments prior to its receiving Royal Assent.

The reason for my concern is that I represent an area of this country which has been adversely affected in past years by companies that have invested in Sudbury and small one-industry towns throughout northern Ontario simply from the standpoint of making a profit and without regard to any benefits to Canadians who live in those one-industry towns.

That is why our Party is greatly concerned about the wording of this clause of the Bill with respect to the very wide and unusual definition of "benefit". It is unusual in the sense that it does not specifically include what the Government of the day means by a benefit to Canadians.

The previous Liberal Government had in place the Foreign Investment Review Act which established the Foreign Invest-

ment Review Agency. That agency, by its name, implied that there would always be a review of any application by a foreign multinational or foreign investor before buying out a Canadian enterprise. We made it very clear in that review that we wished to have a definition of what benefits that company's take-over would have on the affected companies and their employees.

I think it is important to note for Canadians, despite the rhetoric by the Conservative Party and the Government about the adverse effect of FIRA on foreign investment in this country, that from 1975 to 1984, with the exception of 1981 when the implementation of the National Energy Program dictated that many Canadian dollars would flow outside Canada for the purchase of Petrofina, there was a steady increase in the number of dollars invested in Canada. In other words, the perception that FIRA was responsible for a decline in foreign investment in Canada is simply that. It is not fact. It is a perception that was held by the Opposition at that time and I think it was used to put forward the case that FIRA was not beneficial to Canadians and had to be overhauled.

• (1210)

The Tories have replaced FIRA with Investment Canada. I do not want Canadians to go away once this Bill is passed through Parliament with the impression that Investment Canada is not going to have any review function. There will be a review made by the Government under Investment Canada. What is disturbing is that there is no definition of what that review should entail. There is no definition of what the Conservative Government means by a benefit to Canadians.

As I said at the outset of my remarks today, I come from an area of our country that we call a one-industry area. It is not unusual. We have outside of the major urban centres of Canada, Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver and I suppose to some extent, Mr. Speaker, from that great city you represent of Edmonton and one other to the south, the very distinguished city by the name of Calgary, a large percentage of our population living in one-industry towns. That is why the previous Liberal Government placed importance on having a Department of Regional Economic Expansion so we could at least, by use of proper tax incentives and tax grants, entice certain companies to locate in those areas of the country economically deprived in relation to other urban centres of Canada. Having grown up in an area of the country so dependent on a one-industry town, I am more than aware of the requirements that a Government at least have a proper review done of any take-over by companies that operate in one-industry towns.

Under the previous Bill, the Foreign Investment Review Act, we did give a definition of what "benefit" meant. We wanted to make sure that it was quite specific that technological transfer would be prevented by a take-over of a company in Canada. By that benefit we wanted to know what it meant in terms of job opportunities for Canadians who lived in these one-industry towns of which I speak. We wanted to protect job opportunities not only for the workers who are presently