

far bigger and more powerful than the companies we have here in Canada. I am proud that there are now Canadian-owned multinational companies that can operate throughout the world. I want to see more of them. I want this country to be a key actor in the world economy but the way to have that happen is not through this faulty, shoddy piece of legislation. It will happen by taking leadership, by passing up this kind of ideological myth-making and by facing the future rather than running away from the past.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member could give us a few more details on his billboard economics. How many billboards would he propose to put in New York? What would he have these billboards say? What kind of a budget would he allow us as far as these billboards are concerned?

● (1230)

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, frankly, I thought that I would put the Minister's face on each billboard. Second, I thought that we simply could have a quote from the Minister which would say: "Open for business—Canada welcomes foreign investment". If the Minister had wished to have endorsement messages from the spokespeople for his Ministry and each of the opposition Parties, I suspect that we would have been quite pleased. I doubt that he would want our faces on the billboard as well, but I would certainly be prepared to add a clause which would say: "We, too, welcome foreign investment in the country". We believe, under the review mechanisms which exist, that foreign investment can make a real contribution to the country.

I suspect that we could probably have paid the costs of the billboards by cancelling a few of the trips to New York, London and Paris which have been made by Ministers who have tried to deliver the message. If it is propaganda in which we are interested, billboards represent a magnificent option, compared to this gutting legislation which will hurt communities and workers across the country.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, the Member began his remarks by saying that we were speaking from an ideological position. I do not know why he should be surprised at that. We spent the entire campaign telling Canadians that we wanted to open up the country to foreign investment. He has been speaking for 20 minutes on his ideological position. Are we not entitled to speak on our ideological position?

He went on to say that we used fallacious and irrelevant arguments. Well, if we have a philosophical position, it is based on the premise of a free market system, on an investment policy, and on the jobs which will flow from that philosophy. It is all right for him to say that the arguments are fallacious and irrelevant, if he continues to argue from his socialist position. Of course, our position will look irrelevant and illogical if he has a socialist mind-set and tries to apply his arguments to a free market system. If he will think for a moment of a wholesome free market system, then he will see

that the arguments which flow out of the legislation are totally relevant, logical and that they hold water.

He said that the process has been an insult to the parliamentary tradition of Canada. Wait a minute. We spend about eight weeks last summer arguing for an open business economy in Canada. As a result of that campaign—and his Party voted to have FIRA made stronger—we elected 211 Members. Is it not logical to assume, as those arguments were ventilated for eight weeks, that the Government which was elected on that platform should be entitled to its legislation? It seems to me that is parliamentary tradition.

The task force on reform visited the United Kingdom a few weeks ago. The thrust of the U.K. Government's entire parliamentary calendar was that once a Government is elected and it follows through on the manifesto which it presented during the election campaign, then it is entitled to the legislation. The Hon. Member should not say, because he is arguing from a socialist position against our philosophy, and because we have imposed closure, that we are violating parliamentary tradition. We are simply following through on what we said we would do.

He also argued that the Bill will redistribute across the country. Of course it will. The socialists would like to have it done through a central agency. We want to distribute on a freedom basis in order to let the market forces work. It does work.

Last week I received a news release from a company in British Columbia. Partly as a result of the cancellation of the National Energy Program, that company is now able to build a fertilizer plant in my riding. That will provide 1,300 jobs during the construction period and it will provide 200 jobs when the plant is in operation. That is what this kind of program does. Opposition Members want to have direct job-creation programs. That is what this kind of a market-oriented program will do.

If the Hon. Member wants to argue from his socialist position, he should say that he is a socialist, that he is arguing from a socialist philosophy and, therefore, the legislation seems illogical to him. I would ask the Hon. Member to please not say that when we argue from a free market concept we are illogical. He should not impose his arguments on our philosophy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Langdon: Mr. Speaker, I have tremendous respect for Conservative ideology. I believe it is a particular world view which is consistent, logical and incorrect. Nevertheless, it is deserving of respect. I would welcome debates of the sort to which the Hon. Member has referred. However, in the House, we are talking as Canadians representing our constituents; 1.5 million of whom are out of work. We should be talking about practical, real and immediate ways to get the country going once again. This is not a debating society in which we trade views with respect to philosophy. As I see it, this is a parliamentary chamber in which we try to grapple with the economic problems of the country, in a pragmatic and realistic way.