

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just for the sake of better understanding and better work on this Bill at report stage, there are a couple of expressions that are new to Members, including myself. For example, at item 9 you said that Motion No. 13 seeks to introduce into the Bill new proposals which go beyond the "four corners of the Bill".

Second, in item 8 you state that Motion No. 12 has been grouped with Motion No. 8 "and others". Could you explain what "others" means?

Mr. Speaker: What is meant in the second case is that the grouping was already indicated in paragraph 6. I was trying to comment on each clause in order. This meant that in dealing with a subsequent clause, that clause was already grouped with an earlier clause.

If the Hon. Member looks at item No. 6 in the document, he will see the point that I am making. In other words, once I have given the grouping once, I do not repeat it.

With respect to "four corners of the Bill", I think pride of authorship allows me to say that it is meant to say outside the scope of the House of the Bill. We will now proceed to Motions Nos. 1 and 2.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg-Fort Garry) moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-15, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 6 to 14 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) Recognizing that increased capital investment and innovative technology would benefit Canada, the purpose of this Act is to provide for the notification and review of proposed investments in Canada by non-Canadians in order to ensure that they contribute to economic growth and employment opportunities, and to encourage beneficial investment in Canada by Canadians."

Mr. Speaker: As I indicated, I propose to group that with Motion No. 2 by the Hon. Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Landgon).

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex-Windsor) moved:

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-15, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 7 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"the technology under the appropriate terms and conditions established by the government, would benefit Canada, the pur-"

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, may I beg your indulgence to say that I very much appreciate the work that you and the Clerk's office have done in dealing with this substantially large number of amendments. As you say, we have the right to reserve our comments until Thursday but we certainly appreciate the effort that has gone into trying to bring some order to this legislation. The amendments themselves are perfectly clear but we are glad to be able to offer them in a coherent way in order to aid and abet the development of better legislation. Therefore, I want to express my appreciation to you and the staff.

In moving Motion No. 1, I think we should go back to what has been a continual demand for clarity by all those who appeared before the committee. Even in the statements by the

Investment Canada Act

Minister himself there was the admission that in dealing with an investment community it was particularly important for the Parliament of Canada to make its intentions clearly known and not confused with any form of ambiguity.

• (1120)

The reason we moved Motion No. 1 is to attain that objective. First is to demonstrate clearly that the major focus of this legislation is a review procedure for foreign investment. It is a weak review procedure, it is an ineffective review procedure, it is a review procedure that will have limited impact but nevertheless it is a review procedure. To try to camouflage that somehow in the Bill runs against the signalling that is required for us to show the investment community, Canadian and otherwise, what the purpose of this legislation is.

What we are trying to point out is that the investment should be clearly targeted at having a benefit for Canada. One of the overriding concerns that we have raised during the course of the second reading debate and during the committee hearings, which was underlined time and time again by witnesses who appeared before us, is that foreign investment by itself is not an untrammelled virtue. It must be measured and judged by the impact it has on jobs, new technology and direct economic benefits. A number of cases were brought forward to cite how in fact foreign investment could be used to reduce employment, to reduce technological development and to reduce economic performance in Canada and, that foreign investment itself could be used to strip down emerging industries in the high-tech field. It could put newer Canadian businesses out of business. It could be used to crowd out the market-place by the superior market power of the large foreign-owned corporations. The reason for having a review is at least to try to ensure that the ability of this country to protect its own investment community is one that is a clear purpose of this legislation.

It is important to set forward that purpose in a very obvious and unmistakable fashion so that we know there is a purpose here now. Our Party intends to introduce a number of amendments that we hope will be incorporated in the Bill to ensure that that review procedure is improved and we are able more effectively to judge investment applications that will have an impact on Canada in a beneficial way and not in a negative way. We recognize that there is a different philosophy at work, which is simply to say on the part of the Minister and his Government that all foreign investment regardless is good.

But the Minister does not follow the logic of his and his own Government's rhetoric because if that was the point they would have no review procedure whatever. As it is, they maintain a review procedure but the review procedure itself is not a particularly effective, worthwhile or important one because it does not deal with the kind of problems clearly identified during the course of our committee hearings. There can be serious damage or negative results affecting resource communities, smaller businesses in Canada and the investment community dealing in high technology. Those are the areas