

municated clearly to the Canadian public. This legislation was communicated very, very clearly to the Canadian public. Hon. Members opposite knew that. As a matter of fact, some of them shared platforms with me last summer and took an opposite view. The people of Canada knew that we would do it, and they chose us on September 4 partly because we would do it. We are doing it, and we know what we are doing.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, my answer will be very short. As I said during the course of my remarks, I have no argument with the mandate which was given on September 4, but Canadians did not have an opportunity to see the Bill at that point in time. They did not know what would be in it. In fact, I recall for the benefit of the Hon. Member that during the course of the election the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion was contradicted by the Minister of Finance who was contradicted by the then Leader of the Opposition. They all had different points of view on what they would do in the area of foreign investment. One was to abolish it totally, one was to conduct a review. They all had different positions.

I am simply pointing out that certainly Canadians voted for a change. They voted for a large number of promises which were made by Mr. Mulroney at that time. Since, they have learned that Mr. Mulroney's promises are not really worth the paper they are written on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. The Hon. Member should know that we address Hon. Members of the Chamber by their titles. He should refer to the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), please.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by the comments of the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay). Of course members of his Party put forward their views during the election campaign, including their views on foreign investment and how it should be dealt with. They received a majority. Of course, since they have formed the Government, they will in time get the legislation which they want, and we will no longer have the benefit of a real examination of proposals for take-overs by foreign companies of Canadian companies. We, as members of the Opposition, also put forward our views, and we were also elected. We were elected to come to Parliament to put our points of view. That is precisely what we are doing.

Before the Hon. Member for St. Boniface became a Member of Parliament he was a teacher and was active in the Manitoba Teachers' Society. If, in the years before he became President of the Manitoba Teachers' Society he had wanted to express views which were not in accord with the then leadership of the society and was told by members of the society that they were elected and did not want to hear from him, I wonder what he would have said. Now, because he is a very small part of the administration, he wants the rest of us to keep quiet. Perhaps as a back-bench Member of Parliament on the government side he is not required to speak very often, or they do not want him to speak. We are here to put our points of view, and we intend to do so.

### *Supply*

Let me point out two very serious situations which will not be given any real consideration if we pass the Investment Canada Act. There is a proposal by Gulf and Western to take over Prentice-Hall. Surely the Hon. Member for St. Boniface, as a past teacher or educator, should be interested in seeing that the book publishing industry remains Canadian. If we follow the Government's direction and pass the Bill, we will have no control over that.

Similarly, we have the Mitel situation. It is a Canadian-owned company which deals in an area that will be important in the future. The proposal is that it will now be taken over by a British company. When that happens, we will see more and more of the work and the research required to make that company successful in a very competitive field go either to the United States or Great Britain. The Government is proposing to take away any authority or power it has to see that that company and others remain Canadian. This is why we are raising our objections. I tell the Hon. Member for St. Boniface that we will use every opportunity to put our views before Parliament and before the people of Canada.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to put words in the mouth of my colleague, the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay), but the Hon. Member completely misrepresented what he said. He did not try to stifle debate or anything else. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) said that we were stifling debate in the House, and the point my colleague was making was that we had not stifled debate at all. That completely misrepresents the remarks he made.

I want to refresh the memory of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry by referring to a little publishing company by the name of Irwin-Dorsey. It had 30 employees in the small community of Georgetown in my riding. It was owned by an American company. It was the only operation it had in Canada. It changed ownership in the United States. In order to get approval in Canada to change ownership it had to come to FIRA. FIRA refused the transaction taking place in another country between two companies which affected this little company of Irwin-Dorsey in Georgetown. What happened is that the American company pulled it out of Georgetown and brought it back to the United States. It is doing the same job; it is still shipping books into Canada. However, 30 people in my constituency were put out of work because of the inflexibility of FIRA.

Does the Hon. Member remember that particular case? Does he remember those jobs being lost because of a stupid decision by the Foreign Investment Review Agency, which did not do one good thing for Canada? As a matter of fact, it took jobs away from Canadians. That is what we are talking about when we debate the Investment Canada Bill. Does he remember that case? I will tell him that the people who lost their jobs in Georgetown remember it very well.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, I will make my reply very short. Yes, I remember the case very well, but I think the Hon. Member has it all wrong. It was not FIRA which made the