

*Investment Canada Act*

time. We have seen a few economic conferences under the new Government. They do not need legislative authority to do that. However, I would suggest that this be a requirement. The Government of Canada, through this particular Minister, should not only be implementing an industrial strategy, coming full blown from the brow of the Minister for Regional Industrial Expansion. It should be developed at the base, at the grass roots, community by community, industry by industry. Working people should be involved as well as managers. That is the way to begin to turn around the economy of this province and of this country.

Just the other day I spoke to a conference on industrial strategy at York University. The title of the conference was *Competitiveness Through Technology*. It was extremely interesting to hear the approaches of experts from Britain, the United States and Canada. They considered me one. I was glad to be there. Some of them were discouraged in terms of their efforts to implement an industrial strategy. However, some of them reflected the sense of optimism which we in our task force on jobs found across the country. They said again and again that it was not one vast strategy, that it was a lot of specific measures taken in order to become more competitive, in order to adopt technology more rapidly and see it diffused more quickly within a particular industry, in order to co-operate in terms of marketing in difficult areas of the world, and in order that some of our industries in Canada which compete against each other on the Canadian stage can co-operate with each other in competing against very large industrial players from Japan, the United States and the European Common Market when they go out on the international stage. All of these things require co-operation. You will not get co-operation unless you get the Parties to sit down together. You must get them working together to determine the needs, the kinds of investments that have to be done. They must start to lean on those participants in the industry that are not doing the job in order to encourage investment by Canadians in Canada. You must get a means by which, for example, you can ensure that multinational companies that have not become Canadianized at least provide world product mandates for companies which have been operating in this country for a substantial period of time.

● (1550)

These are the kinds of things that we see as the central element in an industrial strategy for Canada. This is what we would see flowing from the kind of amendments which we have put forward to the Investment Canada Bill. I am perhaps a bit naive in saying that what we have done is try to take the investment in Canada portion of the Bill and make it real rather than simply turning this Bill into a watered-down version of the Foreign Investment Review Act, designed by the Progressive Conservatives to pander to those elements in business which want to see all control over foreign investments simply removed from this country.

I know that it is a tall order in one Bill to try and devise how it is you can work. However, from my reflection, I have come to feel with increasing intensity that we have to find some new

ways of doing things in this country. We have to find new ways by which we can learn about export competitiveness, foreign markets and how we can expand and grow and build our industry. We are not going to do that by simply saying a few pious words to the Minister. Specific measures are needed to ensure that the Minister does carry out an industrial strategy for Canada. That is the purpose of this group of amendments coming from the New Democratic Party.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second group of amendments proposed by my colleague from Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), we cannot speak to all those amendments, there are too many. So perhaps I will restrict my comments to the two main motions, namely Motions Nos. 4 and 6.

[English]

This constructive amendment was, of course, rejected by the Tories in committee. The Liberals propose that the separation of the Minister and the public servants who serve Investment Canada be clearly indicated in the Bill. Investment Canada is not intended as a personal staff for the Minister. That is why Motion No. 4 specifically excludes the word "management" from the Bill and replaces it with "provision of policy direction to the agency".

That is a situation which, in my view, is as clear and concise as anything political I have heard. I have been in politics a long time. One of the greatest difficulties with understanding things political is to be able to differentiate between what is political and what is rules and regulations, the why of the issues and the how to best put into action these objectives. Why should we have a review process? Why should we have a Minister who is interested in seeing that investments in Canada are for the benefit of all Canadians? That is something which any of us in this House could make a speech on for one or possibly two hours.

How best do we do that? How to better implement these objectives that are reached by all of us, as determined by law, is the work of public servants. That is known as the how issues. They are the professionals who best know how to advise the Minister and who best know how to go about doing these things, and should remain in that position.

In this Bill we see that the Minister is going to be charged with management and direction of the agency. We say that the Minister should be charged with providing policy direction, but should not be charged with management. That is the prerogative of the public servants and rightly so.

We have a different view from the Government on this question. I think Canadians understand that we justifiably hold that view since we believe there should be a division between the Minister's staff and his policies as he sees them and as his Party enunciates them and how public servants would carry out the directives. Otherwise the Minister leaves himself open to accusations of being friendly to the big contributors, to his personal friends and so on, and very narrow in