

we are doing is saying that there could be a vote attached to this and we will have a vote deferred to Monday, we can deal with that right now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will tell you what we should do, if I may. I think you should pursue it behind the curtains, or do you want to make a final statement now?

Mr. Deans: If I may, Mr. Speaker, it is important to clear up what may be left as a misconception. It is true that the Government House Leader indicated to me earlier in the day that he would call an Opposition Day on Friday. But it was only a very short while ago that he indicated to me that he had had discussions with the House Leader of the Official Opposition and that that indeed was going to happen.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I talked to both Parties.

Mr. Deans: I am saying it was only a short while ago that I was informed, after discussions, that indeed it would happen. That is when I asked that it be announced today. It is not as though I knew hours ago that it was actually going to happen. I only knew a few minutes before the House Leader rose that in fact it was going to be called.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I told the Hon. Member that earlier in the day, and I am not going to be fooling around on the floor of the House debating this matter now. I have tried to be as courteous as I can.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say is that even if we were informed of the intentions of the Government, it has to be realized that the formal announcement that it was going to happen was made just a few minutes ago. The Government House Leader has to realize that, first of all, we have to determine between the two Parties who is going to have the Opposition Day. Then, if a motion has to be written, if it has to be a votable motion, we have to sit down and write it. Now, I understand that the Government House Leader thinks of us as speedy, intelligent and efficient people, but to do all of this in 20 minutes I submit is forcing it on us. I thought that the one thing the Government House Leader would agree to is that the requirement that the motion be submitted by six o'clock be at least put off until tomorrow so that we have time to write something down if we have to. I think that is the minimum.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. We still have a few minutes for debate, and if there are any further negotiations I would appreciate it if the House Leaders for the respective Parties would please negotiate behind the curtains.

Investment Canada Act

[Translation]

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 Nos. 1 (Mr. Axworthy) and 2 (Mr. Langdon) (p. 4001).

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part once again in the debate on Bill C-15. Since the beginning of this exercise, I think it must be the fourth time I have had an opportunity to speak to this Bill and especially to draw the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion, the Member for Charlesbourg (Mrs. Tardif), to possible amendments and especially to the dangerous aspects of the Bill she is steering through the House of Commons and which she steered through committee.

● (1740)

Mr. Speaker, there have already been a number of speakers on the amendment, and I am referring to Motion No. 1 by my hon. friend from Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), and frankly this baffles me, because when I read the motion I did not think a debate would be necessary. I fail to see how a Member of this House could be opposed to the letter and intent of this motion. I can see some of our hon. friends opposite, and I would like hear them say why they are opposed to the fact that the Bill respecting investment in Canada is aimed at recognizing that increased capital investment and innovative technology would benefit Canada, the purpose of this Act being to provide for the notification and review of proposed investments in Canada by non-Canadians in order to ensure that they contribute to economic growth and employment opportunities, and to encourage beneficial investment in Canada by Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, it is like virtue and motherhood. I fail to see how the Parliamentary Secretary can object to having the amendment included in the Bill. I honestly thought her party was pursuing exactly the same goal. Does she really mean that her party is not interested in reviewing proposed investments in Canada by non-Canadians? Does she mean to say she does not think ensuring that such investments contribute to economic growth is a worthy objective? Mr. Speaker, I think it should be the core of this legislation. Who can object to the fact that investments contribute to employment opportunities? Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are not against creating jobs, and that like me, you fail to understand why our friends opposite are not rising to tell us: We agree. We are all for creating jobs. And who could object to encouraging beneficial investment in Canada? I am sure there is not a single Member in this House