

Supply

made an Order for Return, this return would be tabled immediately. I might indicate that it is about two inches thick.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 145 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

FEDERALLY APPOINTED PROSECUTORS

Question No. 145—**Mr. Angus:**

As of (a) December 12, 1984 (b) September 3, 1984 (c) December 3, 1979, what was the name, law firm and community of all federally appointed prosecutors?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Dick: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT—TIME ALLOCATION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Axworthy:

That this House condemns the Government, not only for its failure to protect Canada from potential problems of foreign direct investment as demonstrated by the Government's failure to take effective action in dealing with foreign takeovers in the cases of Mitel and of the book-publishing industry, but also for its contempt for the Parliamentary process by cutting off free debate on its iniquitous investment legislation without providing adequate time for consideration of dozens of important and constructive amendments.

Mr. Speaker: At one o'clock the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria) had completed his speech. His time had expired. I will now recognize Members who wish to participate in the usual 10-minute question and comment period following a speech.

Mr. Stackhouse: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of his remarks, the Hon. Member made reference to this motion as an indication of a Government not willing to participate in the parliamentary process. The fact is that motions of this kind were introduced by the Liberals in the years from 1971 to 1979 and 1980 to 1984 no fewer than 39 times. Of those 39 times, 23 notices of allocation of time were given in the last Parliament alone.

If this kind of motion indicates a lack of desire to take the parliamentary process with full seriousness, we have learned from magnificent teachers. We are certainly following a much-applied example on the part of the former Liberal Government. In this instance it is a motion which is more than necessary because of the great many times various speakers on all sides of the House have participated in the debate. Thus far the amount of time devoted to this Bill in the House and in committee amounts to sufficient hours that if they were put into numbers of debating days, based on the number of hours usually devoted to government business, we would have debated this issue just under five weeks of parliamentary sitting time. Surely it is time for the debate to terminate and to get on with the next stage and action.

● (1530)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the remarks just made by the Hon. Member. Obviously, I totally disagree with what the Hon. Member said. I am sure that even he realizes that what he said was totally inaccurate. We spent only 20 hours deliberating one of the most important Bills we will see during the life of this Parliament. After 20 hours the arrogant Conservatives have tried to cut off debate on that very important issue which will affect workers in my riding and workers in every constituency across Canada. We want to ensure that there will not be foreign takeovers of our domestic industries and that we will not lose jobs because of the inactions of this Government. To have the unmitigated gall to tell us that 20 hours is enough, when the Conservative Party in Opposition deliberated 200 hours on the Crow legislation, is totally unacceptable. Even Conservatives in the back-benches know that.

Mr. Brisco: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Hon. Member to listen to the facts. Twenty-three associations appeared before the committee for a total of 26 hours. The Minister and his officials, including the clause-by-clause deliberations, took up a total of 14 hours. That amounts to a total of 40 hours at the committee level. I do not know where the Hon. Member gets his 20-hour figure from, but if the facts are borne out by my statement he should be asked to withdraw. His statement is totally inaccurate.

At report stage, the Bill was debated for approximately 10 hours. On three separate motions there were five hours, four hours and 15 minutes, and three hours and 55 minutes of debate, respectively. From where did the Hon. Member get the 20-hour figure? He cannot add.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about House time, not committee time. Perhaps some Tories in the back row do not come to the House very often to participate in debate. Maybe they should.

Mr. Duguay: You do not either.

Mr. Boudria: Thank you. I am glad someone said that I do not speak enough in the House. I will admit to that. I will try to speak more in the future. I am glad to have that kind of