

*Investment Canada Act*

investment by wrapping it up in a defence of the rights of employees and the rights of regions, and so forth.

● (1240)

Mr. Speaker, speaking directly to the motion and the clauses of the Bill concerned, for instance, Motion No. 4 asks that the Bill provide policy direction to the agency established by Section 6; but the Minister's duties already include responsibility for providing policy direction. The purpose of this motion is to make a distinction between administration and management. We found it was very difficult to decide what activities come under management and what activities come under administration, so we felt this amendment did not contribute anything. In fact, it could lead to a very complicated process that would only delay decision-making. Since one of the principal objectives of Bill C-15 is to speed up the review process so that we can take advantage of foreign investment and create jobs as quickly as possible, the proposed amendment would have the opposite effect. That is why we rejected it.

We examined each of these amendments in committee. They were debated, and we explained to Opposition Members why we were rejecting these amendments. They cannot say they did not have a chance to discuss these points. We had very serious reasons for rejecting the amendments. For instance, Mr. Speaker, I am thinking of Clause 5 which is very important and goes to the very core of this legislation, and the amendment in which we are asked to ensure that businesses controlled by non-Canadians respect the rights of workers. As Hon. Members are aware, we have the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which does that equally well, we have the Labour Code, and we have a number of federal-provincial laws that protect the rights of employees. We fail to see why this kind of amendment should be included in legislation that controls investment.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that we did consider the principles the Opposition had in mind in proposing these amendments, and that we concluded that this legislation provides protection, for instance for culture in Canada, our cultural industries and the interests of Canadians while at the same time promoting investment, the investment we need to create jobs and reduce unemployment which is far too high here in Canada.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to take part once more in the very important debate on a piece of legislation which will certainly have a major impact on the future of Canada. After learning from the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) to what extent she took the views of Opposition Members into account before deciding how to vote in committee, I must tell her that we were not born yesterday. I know quite well that the Hon. Member for Gatineau and the Parliamentary Secretary were simply following the instructions of the minister. The Parliamentary Secretary had his marching orders. In fact, because of the contribu-

tions made by Members opposite, we are back in this House today to address not only the few committee members who are under the Minister's orders, but also the rest of the Members opposite, like the Hon. Member for Portneuf (Mr. Ferland) and his colleagues who might be able to bring pressure to bear on the Minister to make sure that the principles advocated by the Official Opposition and the NDP will be included in this Bill before it is passed by the House.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in bearing the interpretation of the Member for Gatineau about the Domtar issue. Mr. Speaker, I know that you yourself are not indifferent to this matter, and if the Hon. Member for Gatineau can say that it was all quite simple and that the Regional Economic Development Agreement between Canada and Quebec will take care of everything, it just goes to show that she did not follow that case as closely as you did, Mr. Speaker, since she would have us believe that it will automatically be included in the Quebec Economic Development Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member for Gatineau is quite wrong regarding both the facts and her version of them. In fact, what happened—

**Mrs. Mailly:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Mailly) on a point of order.

**Mrs. Mailly:** I believe it is against the rules to involve the Speaker in a debate which would jeopardize his neutrality.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, if one cannot address the Chair, I wonder whom one can address!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** To put an end to this debate, I shall simply remind the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre) and also the deputy whip that the motions now under consideration still deal with the Investment Canada Bill and the amendments moved by your colleague from Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) among others, and that the relation between that matter and your present comments is rather tenuous.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure you appreciate my dealing with investment in Canada, the Bill now before us being the Investment Canada Act. Certainly the Domtar issue has to do with investment, and I would like especially to commend the part you took in that issue. Certainly it is not by letting things go, as the Hon. Member for Gatineau is trying to do, that this problem has been solved. It has been solved because there has been efficient and powerful action by the community, and in that sense it is my hope that the Canadian business community also will get in the act and will try to limit the damage now being done by the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens) to Canadian business own-