

encouragement given to me by a Conservative back-bencher. I will attempt to speak more often in this House, and more forcefully, at every possible opportunity. I appreciate the kind of encouragement given to me by the Hon. Member who so rudely interrupted.

The issue which we were discussing is that not enough time has been spent debating this Bill. The proof of that is that the Conservative back-benchers have hardly participated in the debate. On behalf of the Tory book-ends, the surfers who were elected along with the tide in the last election—and who will likely go out with the tide in the next election—I demand more House time so that we can discuss this very important issue. The Hon. Member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart) has told the constituents of his riding on many occasions that FIRA had to be strengthened. On his behalf, and on behalf all the other Tories who have not spoken, I demand more House time so that we can speak about this very important issue. I am sure the Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick), who will make a contribution in the debate, will undoubtedly be aware of that.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Hon. Member would ever yield the floor to allow anyone else to give a speech. All he does is talk. If he listened to the 20 minutes prior to one o'clock he would know why most people in the country find Parliament boring. He did not say one thing which had any foundation or one thing which made any common sense.

He said that he was not against foreign capital coming into Canada. I would like to suggest that his Party was not against that. After all, 93 per cent of the applications to FIRA which went before Cabinet were approved.

The Hon. Member said that he wanted the best deal for Canadians. I do not believe anyone in this House would disagree with that. The fact is that we do not think that their way of doing it is the best, and the Canadian public agreed with us when they sent 211 Conservatives to the House on September 4, versus 40 Liberals.

The Hon. Member asked whether we were willing to take control and move on quotas to protect Canadian industry. I would like to tell him how much better we will do than the Liberals did. We will not allow 53 million pounds of European Economic Community beef into Canada. I will guarantee that we will cut that amount down from the 53 million pounds which the Liberals allowed in last year.

The Hon. Member said that this Government had not moved on any agreements. We have extended the agreements on shoe manufacturing. He should know that, as he has some shoe manufacturers in his riding.

The Member spoke about promises and that we would not implement FIRA to protect our international rights and obligations. He listed a number of promises which were made by the Conservative Party during the last election. If he knew what he was talking about, he would realize that each and every one of the promises to which he referred related to GATT negotiations, the rights which we have under GATT, the tariffs which exist under GATT and the ways in which we

can defend ourselves through anti-dumping and other mechanisms. Those are the promises which he mentioned. There may be others which deal with FIRA, but certainly the ones to which he referred do not.

The Hon. Member has spoken at length about FIRA. Why is the Liberal Party so bound to one simple Act under which they approved 92 per cent or 93 per cent of the applications which went to Cabinet? Why are the Liberals taking up so much House time when the people of Canada agreed in the last election that the system was not working? Canada had an unemployment rate of 6 per cent when FIRA was introduced, and it is now pushing an unemployment rate of 11.5 per cent. That tells us that the Liberal way was not necessarily working. Why not revise it? Our Party has given it a different name—Investment Canada. Why should we not give it an opportunity to work? Why do the Liberals not think of some other mechanism and be constructive? Why is the Liberal Party tied exclusively to an out-dated out-moded, old-fashioned idea which was not working well? Perhaps the Hon. Member could explain why the Liberals are tied to something which is out of date.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to discuss issues which are out-moded with a Party that still supports the Ontario Conservative Government which was in office for 43 years.

Mr. Dick: What relevance is that?

Mr. Boudria: I am glad to discuss out-dated issues with Tories; it gives me pleasure. They were talking about the fact that the policies were out-dated. The Hon. Member opposite, whose Party wants to revert to a policy which was used 30 or 40 years ago—

Mr. Dick: Investment Canada was not there 30 years ago.

Mr. Boudria: —is now saying that the policies of the previous Government are out-dated. But, the Hon. Member is advocating policies which are decades old. Why is it that the Conservatives are always adding restrictions to their promises after the election? I have a list, which I have brought to the attention of the House on a number of occasions, of the 338 Tory promises. Why does the Hon. Member now say that this promise only affected such-and-such an endeavour? He has placed restrictions on his own promises. The Conservative Party should have come clean with the people before the election. It should have been forthright with its promises, instead of adding caveats after the fact.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following Bills without amendment: Bill C-30, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and to repeal the International De-