

little more closely, one finds that there would arise, in any agency research through the examination process, confidential information. That would only be natural if the agency research were done to a respectable standard. The New Democratic Party would ask that that information be made public, and I believe I speak on behalf of all businesses when I say they would be very strongly against operating in the kind of environment where, on the one hand, we encourage investment which will open up Canadian jobs, opportunity and economic growth, and on the other hand we say, "Well, the agency has done some research, has uncovered some confidential material and now anyone in Canada can come and take a look at it". I think that is very unfair.

Motion No. 12 asks for the agency to compile and publish information about the performance of foreign-owned companies, again, with typical New Democratic Party fervour. To examine these foreign-owned companies sounds very noble, on the face of it, and when one looks at the role which we see for Investment Canada, one finds that, of course, within reason, there will be the release of statistics and information which will be relevant to the different industries which are involved. The implication in the wording of this motion that the performance of a company is going to be monitored for some purpose—the purpose is unstated in this motion—and it is told that it has to fulfil certain criteria, is something to which I addressed myself earlier. What I told the New Democratic Party then, and I must now repeat, is that in my home Province of Saskatchewan we looked at the nationalization of the potash mines and the role which the state plays to such a great extent in the lives of business people, and found out what that does to the psychology of investment. The Government should deal realistically and openly with the people, hoping to become part of their economy. The people should not think that their Government does not really trust them. Their Government should not act as if it does not give the average man and woman investor in this country enough credit for their ability to know what is good for the operation of their company within the safeguards of our Bill as it stands.

Motion No. 63, Mr. Speaker, is another New Democratic motion. I do not know why I chose three New Democratic motions, except that they seem to be the most hopelessly off-base of the package. This particular motion requires the publication of decisions and undertakings. Again it sounds so noble in all the idealistic and rather naive fervour of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Riis: You don't have open Government.

Mr. Mazankowski: There's not one of them that's ever met a payroll.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please.

Mr. Gormley: The Minister says that not one of the New Democratic Party Members ever met a payroll, and I think that this is a very accurate statement to those who follow this political Party's attempts in this House. Undertakings will sometimes contain or reveal commercially sensitive informa-

Investment Canada Act

tion. I think that is self-evident. An undertaking by anyone who is dealing with Investment Canada, by its very nature, will contain commercially sensitive information.

I would like to look now at Motion No. 63 and perhaps address my concerns in a little broader way about the communication and disclosure which is a part of this Bill by its very nature. For example, Motion No. 63 asks that somehow the decisions and undertakings be publicized. Originally, in Bill C-15 there was no prohibition on the disclosure of decisions or of information contained in written undertakings in a lot of cases. This will ensure that the public can be informed, and the Government has already shown that it means to disclose the information in cases where there is a public interest, such as, for example, in connection with the recent Chevron-Gulf and Texaco Canadian reserve cases where details of the undertakings were in fact made public. Again, if we go back to what Bill C-15 attempts to do, we find that safeguards are already evident, as well as the important measure of accountability.

It has been said by some Hon. Members of this House, in addressing their thoughts to accountability, that the Bill does not make the Government accountable. If I can refer members of the Opposition to Clause 44 of the Bill, they will find that accountability is spelled out. This ministerial accountability will empower the Minister to prepare a report on the operations under this Act to be laid before each House of Parliament. Rather clearly, this clause has the Minister explaining to the committee and to the House of Commons the functioning of Investment Canada.

I have not been very political up to now, Mr. Speaker, on the way this Bill has passed through this House to date. But I think what should be on the record at this point is the performance of the opposition Parties in the plethora of motions which have been moved, the taking up of so much valuable time of this House of Commons and the level of debate which has gone on to this point. Debate on second reading of this Bill lasted 16.5 hours. This particular Bill was in committee for 40 hours where all seven of these motions were dealt with in some form. Now the Bill is at the report stage and we have been in debate for over 18 hours. I would like to say that these motions as proposed would simply reduce to the most distrustful terms the way that Government encourages business in Canada. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I speak strongly against these motions.

● (1650)

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on behalf of my Party to speak about an extremely important matter. What propelled me to this House with such haste to ask my colleagues whether I could speak out of the normal order was the opportunity I had to listen to the speech on television of the Hon. Member who preceded me. He talked about—

Ms. McDonald: A lot of drivel.