

*Supply*

hope even the government of the day was not made aware of the current deliberations of the National Energy Board. That would have been quite improper and incorrect. We were acquainted with the conclusions of the National Energy Board when the National Energy Board report was given to the government some time in April. The cabinet since has had time to read the report, examine it and weigh its arguments, and we have come to the conclusion that the best way to ensure progress in the realization of the whole projet is to endorse and accept the report of the National Energy Board because, as the hon. member knows, our choice under the law is either to accept or reject that report.

By accepting it, we are ensuring that at least part of the line is going to be built. It will reach Quebec City.

As soon as it is finished and if the National Energy Board, after having held hearings, comes with further recommendations, and if Q and M makes a further application and there is a positive recommendation, I hope the cabinet would endorse it, and we would be in a much better position to realize the full line in time for the people of the maritimes to benefit from the realization of this project. That is our approach, that is our policy, and I believe it is a very honest, realistic and reasonable approach to this issue. In his last intervention I do not think the hon. member interpreted the situation adequately or fairly.

**Mr. Johnston:** Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for South Shore has asked me to provide an update, as I understand it, on the so-called privatization plans which, as many hon. members will recall, were initiated back in 1976 by the Liberal administration, the idea being to examine certain Crown corporations and also certain operations of government which might be susceptible to transfer to the private sector.

As I recall, deputies were asked to identify certain areas, and a number of corporations were on the list and were being reviewed prior to the change of government. I just say that because I believe my predecessor, the hon. member for York-Peel, often portrays himself as being the father of privatization, which he is not.

In any event, my predecessor did commission a review of five Crown corporations and the evaluation of those corporations by independent consultants, being First Boston Corporation and A. E. Ames. The corporations in question which were the subject of those studies were the CDC, de Havilland, Canadair, Northern Transportation and, I believe, Eldorado. We have received a preliminary evaluation of the CDC from A. E. Ames, and we expect to receive further evaluations within the very near future on all of these five Crown corporations.

With respect to what steps we have taken, we have taken none other than to wait for these reports to come to us, and also to suspend—but not disband—the advisory committee, which was appointed by my predecessor, under the chairmanship of Mr. Derek Hannaford.

The matter has not been abandoned, but it is not an idealogical issue with us on this side of the House. We look

at the question of privatization in the whole context of achieving greater efficiency in government.

[*Translation*]

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. It being 9.45 p.m., pursuant to the terms of the order made Tuesday, April 29, 1980, it is my duty to put forthwith—

[*English*]

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there would be a disposition for the House to continue a little further with the examination. I note that it is not ten o'clock. I know what the Standing Orders are, but I wonder if there might be a disposition to allow the hon. member for Kindersley-Lloydminster, who has been very patiently waiting, to ask questions of the ministers. I wonder if the ministers, now that they are here with their officials, would accommodate him.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton seeks the unanimous consent of the House to carry questioning on for some time.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pinard:** Mr. Chairman, I am surprised by the request made by my hon. colleague. I would like to accommodate him, but if I create a precedent by accommodating one of my colleagues, whom I respect very much, I would place myself in a very bad position because several members who wanted to speak have not been able to do so precisely because the time allotted is rather limited, even though we must admit that we have had a very good day's work. In view of the circumstances, I would not like to be unfair towards other members. Yesterday, I stated unequivocally that I considered all members on both sides of the House as equal. I believe I would be going against this principle if I allowed an opposition member to speak, without doing the same for my colleagues who would like to do so and without the House being able to adjourn before midnight, or else very late this evening. There has been an agreement, and all I want to do is keep to it. Next fall, there will be days when the House will sit in Committee of the Whole, sometimes until midnight. I believe we have been more than reasonable, and I am convinced that my hon. colleague will understand the position I am taking this evening in the name of fairness, and I call on his good judgment to understand my attitude.

● (2150)

[*English*]

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to the remarks made by the previous speaker, the difficulty consists just of choosing one member and not being fair to other members. Perhaps the minister might consider the committee sitting until eleven o'clock, taking the chance that many members can be heard. It is very difficult for us to find a chance to ask the ministers questions, other than the brief ones during the question period. We have the ministers here and their officials