Order for Return

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 82 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 82 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

MR. ROGER C. NANTEL

Question No. 82—Mr. Boudria:

- 1. Since September 4, 1984, did Mr. Roger C. Nantel, Nantel Communications and Media Canada receive any money from the Government and, if so, in what amount?
- 2. Where contracts involved and, if so, in each case, what was the nature and amount of the contract?
- 3. Were such contracts put to public tender and (a) if so, which ones (b) if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

[Translation]

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I wish to inform the House that because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 10 minutes beginning at one o'clock p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 82—FREE TRADE—INVESTMENT

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor) moved:

That this House condemn the Government for its refusal to reject flatly U.S. demands for unlimited investment freedom in Canada as part of the free trade negotiations, since these demands would threaten Canadian sovereignty and cultural integrity by removing Canada's ability to review and limit U.S. investment, so as to promote Canadianization and to ensure that U.S. investment does benefit Canadians by creating jobs, enhancing exports, expanding research and development and increasing sourcing from domestic suppliers.

• (1240)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have to begin by saying that in many respects it is ridiculous to be debating whether or not this Government is taking yet further steps to weaken investment regulations in this country. The steps which have already been taken over the past few years have been so excessive, so out of tune with the concerns of Canadians and so potentially dangerous to jobs, to the economic sovereignty of our country and its future, that it frankly defies the imagination. Yet it is this Government which has taken those steps to put in place a weak, limp Investment Canada agency which is mainly designed to promote investment rather than to regulate it.

With respect to the free trade discussions, whether we take one set of words, another set of words or yet another set of words, amid all the confusion which has taken place this week, it is absolutely clear that the United States, as it admitted—as it stressed, in fact, in its statements with respect to Canada—that is not satisfied. The U.S. considers these investment barriers which still exist, these mild, meek, Mr. Milquetoast barriers as offensive. So this Government, as has been made clear here this morning, is willing to talk about moving yet further in opening up investment restrictions.

There have been a series of statements from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) throughout this week, a set of defences of foreign investment, which are as inaccurate as one could possibly imagine, which are as far from the truth as one could potentially expect anyone to state in this Chamber, and which are simply parodies of the reality that exists.

The reality is that we as a country are facing a very serious threat to our capacity, economically, to decide where we go in the future. We are facing that threat partly because of legislative changes made by the Government and partly because of a major series of takeovers which have swept across North America. It is not just a Canadian phenomenon; there has been a major series of takeovers particularly prevalent in the record of foreign investment.

As the most recent report of the Investment Canada agency itself makes clear, 94 per cent of the investment that has come into this country has come in, not to expand new businesses, not to establish new jobs and new enterprises for Canadians, but to take over existing Canadian enterprises and, in many cases, as a consequence, to reduce the number of Canadian jobs available within those plants.

In looking at this basic record of investment and this basic record of confusion with respect to the trade talks and what precisely the Government hopes to do in the trade talks with respect to investment, we have to look very carefully at the record of enforcement of Investment Canada. It is Investment Canada itself, as weak-kneed as it is—Mr. Milquetoast—that is at least supposed to provide some kind of defence mechanism to communities. If Investment Canada is not putting into effect the agreements it reaches with foreign firms, if it does not monitor those agreements effectively, then we have a situation which is even worse than the situation which has been