

The purpose of the amendment before us today is to try to establish due process to allow a method of appeal and to allow determinations to take place. The effect of not allowing that to proceed would be to create a serious inequity for many people.

I cannot give the Hon. Member the assurance that nowhere before the courts at the present time is there any case which relates to this. However, I can tell the Hon. Member that there is no hidden agenda here. There is no intention to try to frustrate the ability of an individual to protect his rights. Indeed, it is just the opposite. The effect of striking down many of these decisions would cause great inequity and unfairness. It would hamstring the ability of the Department to carry out very essential functions.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, the effect of not passing this particular piece of legislation would be to render null and void the appeal procedure. In fact, it could operate in reverse for a great many cases that have been satisfied on behalf of the citizenry of the country. It was with that information that I recommended that our caucus accept this particular Bill and this particular clause.

● (1630)

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

* * *

INVESTMENT CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, April 23, 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).

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, could you clarify where we are as far as the amendments are concerned and whether we are dealing with Motions Nos. 1 and 2 as a package? I would like that clarification and to know whether or not I am permitted to speak?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Motions Nos. 1 and 2 are grouped for debate with a separate vote on each motion. The Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate has the floor (Mr. Baker).

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we have heard many opinions expressed as far as these amendments are concerned. If one reviewed the record in order to read what Members of the Official Opposition have

Investment Canada Act

said about these amendments, one would see that the amendments themselves are absolutely necessary if the intent of the legislation is to be followed within the legislation—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. I know that the Hon. Member realizes why I am rising since he spoke initially in this regard, and I regret that I was not in the Chair then because I would have enjoyed listening to the Hon. Member, but I am afraid that he is not entitled to speak. Therefore, I must recognize another Hon. Member for debate.

[Translation]

The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You are very good in French and I congratulate you. You are almost as proficient as the President of the Privy Council, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

[English]

That being said, I want to say a few words about Motion No. 2 that is before the House. Motion No. 2, which is in the name of the Member for Essex-Windsor (Mr. Langdon), reads:

"The technology under the appropriate terms and conditions established by the government, would benefit Canada, the pur—"

This is an important motion because it deals with the whole question of technological change, science and technology and research and development which are so important in society today.

I have had a good look at the industrial set-up of our country and ownership in our country. One of our greatest problems is that very little research is done in our country compared to that in other countries around the world. In fact, I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, as a Member from Edmonton are as dismayed as I am that so little research is done in Canada and that there are so few jobs for young people in research and development compared to jobs in the United States, Japan, western European countries and most other industrialized states.

If I remember correctly, the percentage of our Gross National Product that is spent on research and development is approximately that of countries like Egypt or Ireland. I suggest that says a lot in terms of some basic faults in our economy.

One reason for the small amount of research and development in this country is the fact that much of our economy is foreign owned and controlled. Therefore, it is only natural that when decisions are made about where to conduct research and development, those companies do it at their patent plants in the United States, Japan or elsewhere. Of course, that is no surprise because if you or I were in control of a company and were going to conduct research and development, I think we would do it in our own country in order to provide jobs for our young people here rather than somewhere else in the world.