

Business of the House

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take a minute to quote the words of a Liberal of long ago. This is a very old quotation, but it is true. Here is how it goes:

"I am a Liberal. I am one of those who believe that always and everywhere in any human endeavour there are abuses to redress, new horizons to open, and new forces to develop". Those were the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They were true in his days and they are still true today, Mr. Speaker. The work must continue. I would urge the Prime Minister to change his attitude towards Canadians so they may regain confidence in him and make this country more prosperous.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please, I believe the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) has a statement to make. I will recognize the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with the House Leaders opposite. In connection with the business for Monday, I would like to advise the House that I may be seeking consent of the House to proceed with legislation concerning the maintenance of ports operations. I am sorry that I cannot be more definitive than that, but it is really contingent and dependent upon what might or might not transpire this weekend.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to hear the Hon. Minister making that point. We understand, however, that both sides are proceeding with discussions and negotiations in a positive and progressive way. We are optimistic that sufficient progress will be made in the next number of hours in order that a settlement can be reached and this notice will be simply that.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations and we agree. We hope that the Government House Leader will give us the benefit of advance notice on Monday morning so that we can get our critics ready and, if needed, the proper information so that we can proceed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, accede to that request.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mrs. Mary Collins for an Address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her speech at the opening of the session;

and the amendment thereto of Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra) (p. 44) and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Broadbent (p. 57).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): There are still questions and comments for the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell (Mr. Boudria). I will recognize the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway).

Mr. Redway: Mr. Speaker, I was most interested to hear the comments of the Hon. Member, particularly those that he directed toward the questions of credibility and consistency and the importance of those issues. I was struck by the fact that there was a good deal of inconsistency in the comments of the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member spoke about two particular issues which concerned him and his constituents. One had to do with the pharmaceutical industry and the other had to do with the textile industry.

On the one hand, in referring to the pharmaceutical industry, the Hon. Member stressed the fact that it was very important to protect consumers. He was not supportive at all of any measures which would help the pharmaceutical industry, that would increase research and development in the pharmaceutical industry, or that would create jobs in the pharmaceutical industry. Contrary to that, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the textile industry he indicated just the opposite. He said that in that particular case we should be looking to protect the industry, the jobs in it, and to try to ensure that the industry remains healthy regardless of what that does to consumers. By doing that he was, of course, stating by implication, if not expressly, that we should not be protecting consumers, that we should not be acting in their interests, that we should not be trying to allow them to buy textile products at the lowest and most reasonable price possible.

Which is it, Mr. Speaker? The Hon. Member cannot have it both ways. If he expects other people to be consistent, should he not be consistent too? Who is he interested in protecting, industry or the consumers? Or is he interested in protecting industry on one hand and the consumers on the other hand regardless of consistency?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I will not pretend to understand Tory logic. It is beyond most people. However, I do not feel it is inconsistent at all to want to protect consumers when they are gouged by the pharmaceutical industry. When an item which is worth \$4 in Canada is worth \$145 in the United States, I do not feel there is anything wrong with trying to protect the consumers.

With regard to the Canadian footwear and textile industry, the industry has shown all of us in this House that the price of Canadian goods has not climbed out of proportion with the price of imported goods at all. The Canadian footwear industry and the textile industry are both worth saving. No one has ever suggested that protecting those industries is against the consumer. If the Tory policy is such that you cannot protect the textile industry, let the Hon. Member say that to