

Investment Canada Act

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. This project is being reviewed. (a) The work planned included paving the runway, taxiway and apron, purchase and installation of a rotating beacon, runway identification lights, two lighted windsocks and a light marking system. (b) \$845,000. (c) August 17, 1984. (d) The agreement with the municipality has not been signed and the work has not been started.

FCC—ONTARIO REGION LOANS

Question No. 322—**Mr. Boudria:**

During the months of January and February, 1985, within the Ontario region, how many loans were approved by the Farm Credit Corporation and, what was the (a) interest rate on each loan (b) total value of the loans?

Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture): There were 53 loans approved at the following rates: (a) 43—12.750 per cent, 2—13.250 per cent, 7—13.375 per cent, 1—13.625 per cent. (b) \$7,630,100.

[Translation]

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-15, an Act respecting investment in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Regional Development; and Motions No. 19 (Mr. Axworthy) (p. 4313) and No. 20 (Mr. Langdon) (p. 4314).

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed, as I rise to conclude my few comments on Motion No. 19 and Motion No. 20, that the Government has decided on what I think is the first Bill to muzzle the voices of the duly elected representatives of the people of Canada, perhaps one of the most important Bills this Parliament will debate. I think there are many other Bills that certainly would have moved much more quickly through the House of Commons, but we are talking about a Bill entitled Investment Canada that will in a sense set out the economic agenda for our country for possibly many decades.

We are sending out a message to foreign investors, foreign entrepreneurs and foreign industrialists. We have made count-

less comments to this point in terms of identifying ways and means to improve this legislation. We have submitted thoughtful amendments to this Bill from the Liberal caucus, as well as from the New Democratic caucus—

Mr. Stevens: Ninety-nine.

Mr. Riis: Ninety-nine says the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens), and I thank him for that clarification.

Mr. Stevens: Forty-seven were ruled out of order.

Mr. Riis: These amendments are proposed in an effort to improve legislation. That is why we are here.

The Government comes forward with a Bill that, in its wisdom, it feels is in the best interests of Canada. We have concerned Members of the Opposition Parties who have gone through the Bill clause by clause thoughtfully in committee and have made a number of suggestions and recommendations on how we feel the Bill could be fine-tuned. One could comment about the Bill itself; but we recognize there is a majority of government Members and we thought we owed the Government a favour in terms of trying to identify how we could improve clauses of this Bill. After thoughtful deliberation as we moved through that very appropriate process, the Government says "We are not interested in hearing any more comments from Members of the Opposition. We are not interested in hearing any more comments from our backbenchers, or the thoughtful reactions of these duly elected representatives of the people of Canada. That is it." We are being muzzled.

Mr. Tremblay (Lotbinière): Enough is enough.

Mr. Riis: "Enough is enough", says one of the Tory Members. This is, as I say, perhaps the most important Bill that we are going to debate in this session of Parliament in terms of what it is going to do to the future of the Canadian economy and Canadian companies attempting to operate in conjunction with foreign subsidiaries in Canada.

We have just seen during Question Period the reason we are concerned about this Bill. The United States has decided in the last number of hours to curtail trade with Nicaragua. We can debate that issue and the merits at some length. Setting aside the wisdom of that decision, that same American Government has now said to its subsidiaries operating in Canada, of which there are many—as a matter of fact, most of those foreign branch plants in Canada are American-owned—if the products they are putting together, manufacturing or creating in Canada have a significant amount of American content, like automobiles, machinery and all sorts of other items, they cannot be exported to Nicaragua. Canadians at this time might be quite encouraged to expand trade with Nicaragua.

Where do those people now turn if they cannot turn to the United States and its allies? To where did Cuba turn? We are right back with the Cuban issue. Cuba had nowhere to turn but to the Soviet Union. Now the United States is saying the