

Similarly I would argue in terms of Motion No. 43 wherein we say that matters or investments in the area of defence production are very much part of our national identity. Mr. Speaker, you have been in the chair during numerous Question Periods in the past three or four months when there were major debates in the House about the whole question of star wars development and its economic implications relating back to Canada's sovereignty. What could be more at the heart of Canada's national identity as defined in the Bill than the question of our defence industry? Surely it is subject to the same kind of review.

Similarly we make the case for Motions Nos. 42, 45, 47 and 49. In effect, they all relate to the social impact of investment in one resource town communities, for example, in the high technology industry. All those areas were identified by witnesses who appeared before the committee as being very much a part of the way to protect our "national identity". If we lose control in those areas we would no longer have a national identity. This is why we recommend very strenuously that these articles be contained within the orbit of the Act.

● (1120)

Mr. Speaker: If I could interrupt the Hon. Member for just one second. With respect, we are supposed to be listening now to arguments as to the procedural admissibility of an amendment. The Hon. Member is making a very interesting and important argument about the substance of the amendments. May I suggest to the Hon. Member that if it is possible, it would be helpful if he would stick with the procedural admissibility question. May I also say to him that by indicating as clearly as he is that they are matters that are not in the Bill and not contained in the scope of the Bill that need to be introduced in his view to the Bill, he is making the procedural argument that they are beyond the scope of the Bill as introduced and therefore out of order. I take it he is trying to make a procedural admissibility argument at the moment. I suggest that he might want to restrict himself to that, both for his own sake and for the sake of the points we are supposed to be considering.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I take note of your comments. I believe from the original submission that you brought forward to the House that you are asking for arguments as to why certain matters should be admissible. I thought I was speaking directly to the procedural point that the Minister had indicated, in this area particularly, that Parliament should help define, because as it now stands under Clause 15, the question of Canada's cultural heritage and national identity is not defined. It is left simply in those words. We are simply adding amendments which would further define the meaning of those two key phrases. That would be my basic argument for Clauses 42 to 49.

I should as well make the case of admissibility on Motion No. 48 because it is a special case. I would simply make the argument that I believe it is an oversight on the part of the Government because it will set up a conflict within the Bill. Later in the Bill, Clause 45, for example, says that any

Investment Canada Act

commitments made under the present FIRA Act would be held in force. However, there is nothing in the Bill to say that investors coming into the same area in which undertakings have already been made would also be required to make the same undertakings. Therefore, it would place them in a kind of grandfathering clause under Clause 45. A new competitor, a new foreign investor coming into the same area would be free of that kind of undertaking made under FIRA and therefore have an incredible competitive advantage.

We think that that should be a part of the reviewable area to make sure that those foreign investors who have already invested in certain areas of the economy and are held to those undertakings under FIRA are not held to disadvantage by new investors coming into the same area. Motion No. 48 is simply a way of dealing with that glitch in the Bill. I would ask you to take that into consideration.

I might now refer to Motion No. 64. The question that was offered again was whether this provided for a new definition under the Act. All we are saying in this case is that it is a way of calculating the question of additional cost. It is simply giving additional direction under this clause. To my mind, it does not constitute a new definition but is simply adding a way of calculating cost or rules for calculation. These are similar to those provisions already incorporated in Clauses 26 and 28 for calculating Canadian status and control. No new principles are introduced. Nothing new is added. These are items that incorporate in Clause 21 undertakings that are already in Clause 20. In order to develop the symmetry and the level of harmony between those two, we think that that should be considered for debate at report stage.

On Motions Nos. 70 and 72, Mr. Speaker, you argue that one vote on Motion No. 70 would be consequential on Motion No. 72. I would suggest that Motions Nos. 70 and 72 are quite different and I would ask that you separate the two for voting purposes. Motion No. 70 is designed clearly to indicate that the lack of ministerial action means the investment may proceed. Motion No. 72 is to specify that a notice rejecting an application is to contain reasons for rejection, as called for by many business groups. They have two quite different meanings and therefore I think there should be separate votes on those two motions.

● (1125)

On Motions Nos. 78 and 79, Mr. Speaker, you asked for a clarification of our position. Again I would simply say that our amendment in no way attempts to expand the scope of the agency. These motions simply seek to modify the rules for determining what has been acquired in Clause 28(3) of the Bill, a clause already approved in principle. These motions do not suggest new rules.

The Government has already defined Canadian control as being ownership of one-third of all shares. We are simply changing the fraction. That does not change the meaning of the Bill. There is a very old story about Mr. Churchill and Lady Marlborough which I will not repeat in this House, but I think we are simply haggling over the price. This particular