

Foreign Investment Act

reciprocal arrangements with our neighbours, we could enjoy the advantages of scale and the lower prices that come from international competition, while at the same time being the beneficiaries of the research, development, product development and market expansion that the big companies enjoy. Our scientists, engineers, technicians, market analysts, brokers, financiers, salesmen, advertisers and others would have full scope for the utilization of their talents, without having to move to another country.

This positive Progressive Conservative policy is far more important than the bill now before us. It is designed, not just to keep the situation from deteriorating further, but to do something about it and move in the direction of a real solution involving greater Canadian participation. Can we do it?

Mr. Baker: Not with this government.

Mr. Hellyer: The hon. member is absolutely right. We cannot do it with this government. All that is required, if we are to do it, is a government which believes in Canada and has a vision for the future of this great country—a Progressive Conservative government, led by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stanfield).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is close to five o'clock. Earlier today a motion for the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 was proposed by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). The Chair indicated at the time that consultations would take place with representatives of the different parties, or the House leaders. This consultation has taken place.

It has been agreed that the motion will be put this evening at eight o'clock, for debate in the course of the evening. There was also discussion at the time as to the possible limitation of the length of the debate and it was agreed, subject, of course, to the order of the House, that the debate might go on from eight o'clock until eleven o'clock this evening. As well, there would probably be an order providing for the suspension or cancellation of the adjournment proceedings.

It was also agreed, I gather, that the first spokesman on behalf of each party in the House is to be given 20 minutes in which to speak, and subsequent participants 15 minutes each. As I said, the motion shall be deemed to have been adopted at eleven o'clock this evening. The motion will be put at eight o'clock.

For the moment, I should like to inquire whether there is agreement from the House as to the time limits which were suggested a moment ago.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, yes, we agree. Without prejudice to any time limitations in future debates, we agree to the time limitations to be imposed on this occasion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Your Honour, you have stated our agreement exactly.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

[Mr. Hellyer.]

[Translation]

Mr. Boisvert: We give our consent, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baker: Five o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED REINSTATEMENT OF RAIL PASSENGER SERVICE IN SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking all necessary steps to reinstate passenger rail service in Southwestern Ontario adequate to the present and anticipated transportation needs of the public.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, this subject has been discussed in this House on previous occasions. The subject matter of rail transportation, particularly service involving passenger transportation in southwestern Ontario, has been debated in this House for many years. I do not know the origins of the issue Your Honour, and I do not know whether the issue first arose because of partisan politics. Nevertheless, I know that in 1973 that issue has become one of equal importance to that of motherhood. Nobody seems to be against rail passenger service in southwestern Ontario; by the same token, nobody, unfortunately, is going to do anything about it.

Since 1968—indeed, before that date—all parties in this House, through their spokesmen, have expressed concern about this passenger service. Two years ago that concern turned to frustration when the recommendations of a standing committee of this House were rejected by the then minister of transport. Let me hasten to add that the recommendations of that standing committee were unanimous. There was no evidence of any partisanship in the report of that committee. I also wish to assure the House that that committee was one of the hardest working and most diligent of committees that this House has ever established. I attended a number of its meetings, although certainly not all. The hon. member who formerly represented my riding in the House has told me of the effort which the committee made in bringing forward that report. What has happened since that report came out has created frustration. For many, that feeling of frustration has turned to a feeling of hopelessness.

I am not the only one in this House who has talked about such feelings of hopelessness. Others have complained about the lack of service. In this regard, may I quote the words of no less a spokesman than the hon.