

Foreign Takeovers Review Act

both participation and democracy. I would feel safer with the straight word democracy. Perhaps the minister would like to see the essay that the Prime Minister wrote upon the subject. My dilemma is that I have no Ivan Head to collect my essays. Not yet, anyway. Had I an Ivan Head, we might begin writing a series of essays about the denigration of the word democracy and the dilemma the government has created by announcing a new concept of participatory democracy, and then avoiding both.

Mr. Pepin: I read your essays.

Mr. Fairweather: Witness the airport at Pickering. There is a fine example of throwing out the phrase participatory democracy and then running back into the hangar.

As I had begun to say before the minister interrupted me, bargains will have to be extracted by the minister in connection with the use of Canadian services and supplies wherever possible. This is now being done, I understand, by the government of Alberta. There has been some grumbling by the foreign corporations concerned, but the government succeeded in extracting certain promises in return for licensing exploitation of the Alberta tar sands. This was a positive provincial initiative and it indicated an area in which a provincial government could be helpful to the minister as he establishes his jurisprudence.

A word in connection with the tribunals under the proposed competition act and the review process in that legislation. It is all very well to say that any differences can be reconciled in committee but it would help us in the committee and it would be useful in the remaining stages of this debate if we knew just how this minuet is to be carried on. Will it be done in the fashion of Arthur Murray, or will it be a Jean-Luc Pepin step? In any event a great deal more interpretation is called for, and I hope the information is given us before we get into committee. Otherwise, people may be required to go through both processes, and it is hard enough to go through one process at the present time when dealing with the government, let alone a double one.

Those are the principal points I have to make at this stage. It was flattering to see the minister making notes of them; I guess he cannot wait to get the "blues". In the light of all the shortcomings I have mentioned, and because the bill is such a weak approach to the whole field, I move, seconded by my hon. friend from Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) whom I have been able to persuade of the correctness of this approach:

That Bill C-201 be not now read a second time but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should consider introducing more comprehensive and more constructive measures which will increase Canadian participation in and control of the Canadian economy.

• (1610)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) has proposed what he described as a reasoned amendment. He and other members may be able to convince me otherwise, but with great respect I think it is not a reasoned amendment as we know it within the rules and precedents of the House. I might indicate to the hon. member that one of the requirements of a reasoned amendment is that it oppose the principle of the bill. The

hon. member has indicated that he does not oppose the principle, but suggests that the government should introduce far more comprehensive and, as he described it, more constructive measures. I will hear argument if the hon. member would like to present it.

Mr. Fairweather: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I might have been better off had I said nothing when introducing the amendment. This is a very important procedural point you have raised, Sir. When the rule changes were made two or three years ago, we changed the status of the second reading stage of a bill from one in which the House accepted the principle, to one in which a whole different series of considerations apply. Therefore, I respectfully suggest it is not out of order to propose an amendment which does not foreclose future action by any group within Parliament. This is the case because of the rule changes made in 1968. We should not be foreclosed, and cannot be foreclosed from this course of action because of the new setup which is inherent in the various stages a bill now goes through; that is discussion now, delineation in the committee, report and then third reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Fundy-Royal, in proposing a reasoned amendment, has referred to the rule changes. If the hon. member can give me authority or precedent to indicate that the rules in respect of reasoned amendments have been changed as a result of the rule changes I will be guided by that. However, it is my opinion that considerations as to the procedural acceptability in respect of reasoned amendments have not been changed by the rule changes. Many hon. members who are learned in procedural matters have argued that this is the case, but because hon. members argue that to be the case does not make it so. With respect, I feel there is no authority vested in the Chair to alter the established principles outlined by Beauchesne and other authorities who have guided us for some time. In my respectful opinion, the rule changes have not changed the considerations I must apply as to whether or not the Chair should accept a reasoned amendment. For that reason, and the reasons I mentioned earlier, I regretfully must come to the conclusion that this is not a reasoned amendment and, therefore, it cannot be put to the Chamber.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I think it was clear to everyone who listened to the minister that he was engaged in a defensive speech, defending the bill and a policy he knew had very little meaning for Canada and for the future of this country. During his speech he put himself in the role of Tevyah in "Fiddler on the Roof". I should like to remind the minister that the first fiddler was Nero, and that is the role that fits the minister much better. It is a much more appropriate role for him in this case, because he is fiddling while Canadian independence is being continuously eroded. That is what this is all about, Mr. Speaker.

If I heard the minister correctly, he expressed the hope there would be unanimous support for the bill. I want to tell him now that there is not. This is a poor bill and a poor substitute for action to protect our country and its future, so we do not intend to support such a useless step as the minister has proposed.