

about are what are commonly known as the "blues". I submit, Mr. Speaker, and it is very clearly established, that the "blues" are not the official record or report of debates. Citation 155.(1) on page 48 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition reads:

The *Official Report of Debates*, commonly referred to as Hansard, is the record of speeches made in the House; it also contains answers to written questions on the Order Paper.

I submit that what the Government House Leader is using as a basis for his argument is not the official report of debates. In fact, Citation 156 at page 49 of Beauchesne's says:

The *Debates* are printed in bound volumes from time to time during a session.

I realize I wear glasses, Mr. Speaker, but I did not see any bound volume of debates. If my hon. friend is basing his argument on what is commonly known as the "blues", his argument must fail.

I would like to make one other point, Mr. Speaker. It is very clear that when the Deputy Speaker occupies the Chair, he has the full authority to exercise all the same powers with respect to decision making as the Speaker himself. This is confirmed by Beauchesne's citing the Speaker of the House of Commons Act, Section 5. It reads:

Every act done and warrant, order or other document issued or published by the Deputy Speaker in relation to any proceedings of the House of Commons, or which under any statute would be done, shall have the same effect and validity as if the same had been done, issued, signed or published by the Speaker for the time being.

By way of conclusion, I would like to say that at this point there is no way that the representatives of the Government can impugn a decision of the Deputy Speaker by implying that in some way it has less force and effect than a ruling made by yourself. The ruling was made by the Deputy Speaker exercising, quite properly, the full authority of the Speaker. That ruling cannot be impugned by any of the interesting, but I must say with all due respect, ineffectual and weak arguments of the Government House Leader and his colleagues.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. I have heard all the House Leaders and a Whip. At this point I am ready to indicate something to the House. It is very simple. The matter was raised at the time. The Deputy Speaker ruled on the matter at the time. The Deputy Speaker stands in this place as the Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Lesick) on debate.

Mr. William G. Lesick (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to contribute to the debate on Bill C-15, an Act respecting investment in Canada, and Motion Nos. 27, 30 and 67 which are presently before the House. This is my first speech before this Chamber, and I would like to take a moment to offer a few of my personal thoughts on the vitally important issue of investment in Canada.

Investment Canada Act

As a new Member of Parliament from Alberta, I came to the House determined to voice the views of my constituents and all the people of Alberta. As a small businessman in Edmonton, I witnessed the devastating and discriminating policies of the previous Government. During my 31 years of small business, I witnessed the province grow into an industrial power. I saw Alberta develop. With that development, I understood and shared the positive entrepreneurial attitude of Albertans.

When, following his return to office, Pierre Trudeau said, "Welcome to the 1980s", Albertans suffered the coldest shower in Canadian economic history in the name of Canadianization. To many Albertans, Mr. Trudeau's scheme of Canadianization turned out to be a lesson in isolation. When the Opposition talks about—

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker I have a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) on a point of order.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I respect the fact that this is the first speech of the Hon. Member, but there is a rule of relevance on report stage. We are dealing with an amendment dealing with the extension of time to 45 days from 30 days. It has nothing to do with what Mr. Trudeau said when he came to office in 1980. I would ask that the Hon. Member address himself to the specific amendment before the House at report stage. If he wants to engage in a larger debate on principle, he will have that opportunity at third reading. Since we have only limited time, it is very important that we deal with the amendments on the table at the present time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member knows that he should be relevant to the topic of the motions. I am sure the Member will do that.

Mr. Lesick: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Canadianization is very important. It is a topic which was brought up by the Hon. Member of the Opposition. It is very important that we should understand this aspect. Confidence is very necessary for us, otherwise no one could invest in Canada. I suggest that that is the real meaning behind the motions that were presented. The other is a question of nationalism and interventionism in the economic forces which drive the market-place.

The motion was perhaps presented by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) with good intentions. Canadians recognize that in order to find new markets and create new jobs and a better future for our children, we must seek out capital from all over the world. The Hon. Member's motion dealing with culturally sensitive proposals underestimates the intelligence of the Canadian community. Placing a time delay on investment, as suggested in the amendment, will serve little purpose. We Canadians know the nature of our society. The people of the country, particularly the unemployed, want economic renewal. I believe that we know how to protect and enhance our own Canadian cultural institutions.