

*Supply*

● (1125)

Let me say to the Government that we are prepared to negotiate and to deal on that basis, but it is the Government that must take the initiative. It must show at least a modicum of interest and goodwill to make that happen. Up to this time, as our resolution clearly states, there has been none of that. There has been a disregard of the committee, a disregard of Parliament, a disregard of the interests of Canadian industry and the economy because the Government is bringing in a Bill that will simply provide for "Open Sesame". The Government is going to allow for a pillaging of our economy that by comparison will make the rape of the Sabine women look like a church picnic.

I do not think this Minister really cares that much about this. I believe what is at the bottom of the whole approach to this issue is that the Minister really wants foreign investment to take over industry in Canada. He is not really concerned about Canadian investment or Canadian involvement. What he really believes is that Canada can operate most effectively as a satellite to other countries. That is the message this Government is giving. In the actions or lack of action it is taking on questions like Mitel, book publishing and legislation such as Investment Canada, the Government is showing what its economic philosophy is. The Government wants Canada to be a branch plant economy. The Government wants to take its orders from Cleveland. That is the kind of approach the Government is taking. It is not providing the kind of direction, purpose and goals that Canadian investors and Canadian business want to make sure that we maintain some control of our industry and ultimately some control of our destiny.

**Mr. Duguay:** Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House knows very clearly during the last campaign we put our position before the Canadian public on the Foreign Investment Review Agency. The contents of this Bill are not strange to Canadians. We told Canadians we would introduce this legislation and we have done so.

I want to comment for a second on the matter of contempt for the Parliamentary process. Up to and including May 1 the House had spent 36 hours on Bill C-15. In addition, the standing committee spent 40 hours. The Liberals have intervened 82 times and the New Democrats 72 times. Considering their number in the House, it seems that to have each member of the Opposition intervene twice on a Bill which the Canadian public knew we were going to introduce really demonstrates the weakness of the Opposition's position. It is a very weak argument if it has to be made more than once.

My point is very simple. The contempt of Parliament is on that side of the House. My constituents phone me on a regular basis and say: "What is stopping you from stopping Opposition Members from getting up day after day to make the same arguments they made yesterday?" The contempt is on that side of the House, not on this side.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Mr. Speaker, I would like some opportunity to respond to the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay).

Let me provide a contrast. The Hon. Member said we had spent some 36 hours or so on this Bill. A year or so ago when I was the Minister of Transport and brought in the grain transportation bill we spent several hundreds of hours in this House on the very same legislation.

**Mr. Stevens:** How much time did you spend on FIRA?

**Mr. Axworthy:** We spent hundreds of hours in debate in this House. We provided the Opposition a full committee hearing that went on for something like six months. Hearings were held across Canada. There were representations from every region. We then spent almost four weeks at report stage in this Chamber dealing with hundreds of amendments. We sat and listened. We also used that process in a creative way. We accepted amendments from the Opposition. We sat down and negotiated with them on amendments.

● (1130)

**Mr. McDermid:** That is because they were good amendments.

**Mr. Axworthy:** That is because they were good amendments. This Government, by showing its absolute disregard and its disdain for Parliament, has never made the offer.

**Mr. Stevens:** Untrue.

**Mr. Axworthy:** It has not even bothered to show up. It has not provided the opportunity to sit down to look at the amendments and decide which ones it should consider, which ones it should bring into effect, or how it could recognize what representatives of a number of distinguished and important Canadian organizations said before the committee. They were all voted down and thrown out in committee. The same is being done at report stage. That is the kind of disregard to which we are pointing.

The reason for the resolution this morning is to try to give these people a deathbed reprieve. We saw the case of Mitel this week. Is the Hon. Member for St. Boniface saying that he is speaking for his constituents and that they are condoning the sell-out of the Canadian high-technology industry? Does he want to see Burroughs leave his riding, disappear, and not have the world product mandate which was negotiated as a result of the FIRA process? Is that what he wants to see? That is what will happen with Investment Canada. Burroughs would not be required to have a plant in St. Boniface doing the kind of operation it is doing, had it not been for FIRA negotiating that world product mandate for that particular plant. It would be useful if the Hon. Member for St. Boniface looked more closely at what is going on in his own riding. Then he might come to the House and approve or support our amendments.

**Mr. Duguay:** Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), I am quite aware of what has gone on in my own constituency. However, my point is really a fundamental one. We have to spend hours and hours amending legislation in committee when it is not very well thought out or has not been com-