

*Supply*

decision. It was the foreign-owned company which closed down that branch plant.

**Mr. McDermid:** There was no choice.

**Mr. Axworthy:** That is why we are fighting against the dumb, stupid policies of the Minister which will allow foreign companies to close down factory after factory, business after business, mine after mine, because there is no longer any policy of direction on the part of the Government which says that we want Canadian control and direction. It is foreign ownership and foreign management, which do not give a damn about this country, that are closing down Canadian plants. We are bringing in amendments to try to protect the Georgetown and other constituencies.

**Mr. McDermid:** You would not let the ownership transfer.

**Mr. Axworthy:** If they were smart, they would look at our amendments and change Investment Canada.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. The period provided for questions and comments has now terminated.

● (1140)

**Hon. Sinclair Stevens (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion I must comment that we have in this motion perhaps the greatest example we have had in this Parliament of inconsistency and irresponsibility. In his speech and in his motion, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) has demonstrated why today he is sitting on the Opposition benches along with various Members of his caucus instead of on the government side of this House.

The Hon. Member says that we have shown a contempt for the parliamentary process by cutting off free debate. One of the first things he said in defence of his motion was that we should not be giving them six Opposition Days to debate. Somehow he is flabbergasted that we have given them freedom for six days to come in, choose their topic and have a debate in this House. How on one hand can a Member ask the House to agree that there is contempt for the parliamentary process by cutting off free debate and then use as part of his argument that this is the sixth Opposition Day and that it is unforgivable to give the Opposition six days of free debate?

**Mr. Axworthy:** It is an abdication of responsibility. Why does the Government not bring in the debate? You are the Government, start acting like it.

**Mr. Stevens:** Here is the inconsistency. If the Hon. Member really believes what he is saying, he obviously would have mentioned it in his motion. Some time between drafting it last night and when he got up this morning, he changed his mind and said "Why on earth do we need a six-day debate? I'm going to go in and criticize the Government for giving us so much time", after yesterday telling us that we were not giving them enough free debate.

**Mr. Axworthy:** Right.

**Mr. Stevens:** And now he says it is right. My goodness, if Fort Garry residents could only see him in his true splendor in this House.

**Mr. Axworthy:** They just remember the Bank of Western Canada.

**Mr. Stevens:** Let me go on.

**Mr. Axworthy:** They remember your wonderful record in the West.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. I would like to hear the Minister's speech and we can then have questions and comments.

**Mr. Stevens:** Let me go on. The motion states that we have not provided adequate time for consideration of dozens of important and constructive amendments. My colleague, the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Duguay), pointed out the various hours that had been given to debate, either at second reading, report stage or in committee. Let me be a little more specific.

At second reading there were 32 Liberal Members who joined in the debate. All but eight of the total caucus had an opportunity to speak at second reading. Twenty-five New Democratic Party Members spoke. All but five of their caucus had an opportunity to tell the House their feelings. Most who attended committee will agree that in committee there was a full opportunity given to both the Official Opposition representative and the socialist party representative to present their case and their amendments. Each was considered. Virtually all were voted on, with the Official Opposition almost consistently voting with the socialist representative at the committee level.

At report stage on Motions Nos. 1 and 2, we have had 23 Liberals join in that discussion and 21 NDP Members. On Motions Nos. 4, 6, 7, 19, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18, we have had 12 Liberals and 11 NDP Members speak. On Motions Nos. 8, 12, 32, 63, 69, 74 and 75, we have had 13 Liberals and 13 NDP.

**Mr. Orlikow:** We are just doing our job. What is wrong with that?

**Mr. Stevens:** On Motions Nos. 19 and 20, there were 12 Liberals and 9 NDP. On Motions Nos. 23, 24 and 25, again Liberals and NDP Members participated. What they are really saying is that they want to filibuster.

When it comes to free speech and free debate, they do not like to let democracy work. They do not wish the majority of the Members of this House, who I suggest reflect the majority wish of the Canadian public, and judging from today's Gallup poll, 54 per cent still say they believe in the Government, to move legislation forward. They basically feel they know best. Notwithstanding the fact that they are two minorities, they know better than the majority what is good for Canadians.