

extent of a guarantee given years ago. It is difficult because the staff are forced to work in a rather nonsupporting environment, especially if the Government of the day happens to be Conservative. They have shown a bent for foreign investment, but they do not seem overly concerned about the rules and conditions inherent in investment approval.

As it is, one public employee is expected to do on his own something which calls for well-advised public input. It should not be the exclusive responsibility of somebody who works in an office in Ottawa, for the workers and the people in the community want to know what is going on, because they may be the people who supply parts to the manufacturing company that has made the investment. The same goes for people who buy the products and others in service industries created by that investment. All kinds of people must be in on it, that is the guarantee, including the shareholders, I would say, since many of those companies probably have shareholders in Canada and in other countries. But Canadian shareholders especially have the right to know exactly what guarantees have been offered by the company and whether it will actually live up to them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Hon. Members that in the past, the concept that information is something very important, that it should be shared with the public rather than restricted to officials or even Members of Parliament, was a view that was never assumed by any spokesman of a Progressive Conservative Government.

The former Member for Peace River, for instance, a man who was respected by all sides of the House because of his efforts in trying to achieve freedom of information, Mr. Ged Baldwin, stated on February 12, 1976, as reported in *Hansard*, and I quote:

[English]

He said:

—it is time for us to act. I know there will be some argument about detail. We will all agree there must be exceptions. Government cannot be asked to conduct all its discussions in a goldfish bowl. When there are working papers leading up to a decision, then I am quite prepared to accept the fact that those working papers should not be available during the time the decision is being considered.

Our recommendations are that the negotiations can be carried out in secret. But then Mr. Baldwin said:

But once the government has arrived at a decision, it would be my submission that all working papers of a factual or statistical nature should be made available so that members of the public would be able to examine the bases upon which the government acted, and evaluate whether or not the government's decision was sound.

What we are saying is that the promises and undertakings made by companies regarding their investment in Canada should be made public as part of the record. If that is done, then you can genuinely have accountability under the foreign investment review process proposed by the Government. It will not just depend on the civil servant, with many other things on his plate, occasionally saying, "well, gee, I wonder about that particular investment that was made three years ago; are they living up to their promises or not?" The chances are under this legislation the civil servant may never get around to it because he will be too busy, and the company is not required to report

every year, as our amendment proposes it should, about how it is fulfilling its undertaking.

In other words, we are not saying that one person who may have dozens of investments to oversee and many other responsibilities, should be responsible for seeing that a promise to create 1,000 jobs in Canada is fulfilled, or a promise to source spare parts in Canada is being fulfilled, or a promise to generate research in this country is being fulfilled. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough. It is well known that the span of control of individuals can only go so far.

One way of getting around that is to make things public so that if something is going wrong, then the workers in a particular plant, or the middle managers or the community or the customers or the suppliers can speak up. They can say that when this company came to Chatham or Ottawa or Montmagny or some other part of the country, it promised to create 350 jobs and buy parts from Canadian suppliers, and it has not achieved that. They can say that this company promised that by 1986 some 49 per cent of its shares would be Canadian owned and it is not moving in that direction. That is the kind of accountability which you cannot have with a secret process.

I recall very much during the course of the election campaign that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) promised we would have a new kind of government. We would have change because so many Canadians were fed up with what had happened under the Liberals.

I welcome the comments of the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) supporting these amendments calling for much greater openness, and I deplore the fact that he forgot to mention that his Liberal colleagues in government prior to last September had not brought in that openness by making the necessary amendments to the Foreign Investment Review Act. We have the opportunity to make up for the failures of the old government. We have a government in power which promised to do that and bring in a process of openness. Our amendments are directed to that process so we can learn from our mistakes, ensure accountability, and get information about how foreign investment actually behaves.

● (1540)

This is not just good management practice. We have to learn to share information with employees if companies are going to be managed effectively in the country. This also does a favour for those foreign investors who want to be good corporate citizens. The foreign investor who wants to be a good corporate citizen is tarred with the brush of those companies that are not good corporate citizens. I am sure there are cases where technology has come across the border and some foreign investment that has been of benefit to Canada. Unfortunately, there are too many cases where foreign investment has not been of benefit to Canada.

However, when the company is living up to its obligations by doing a good job and bringing net benefit to Canada, it is in its interests, as in the interest of all of us, for that information to be there. There was a voluntary process under the Foreign