

I say to the hon. member for Cochrane, knowing his ability and sincerity in respect of watching the public purse—and all of us are involved in this area—that where he could bring pressure upon the government is in the area of changes in the way the estimates are passed through the House of Commons. I should like to suggest to the hon. member—this should be considered by any government in power—that there should be a wider range of appointments made to boards. This does not include members of parliament. If the government wants to hear what the grass roots think, they should not appoint to a port authority those people who have an interest in it, who make money from it and therefore wish to maintain it; rather, a farmer should be taken from Saskatchewan who is interested in the movement of his grain through that port. If he were placed on the port authority I am sure he would make known some of the things which could be done in respect of it.

When the advisory board in respect of regional development is set up it should contain individuals who are concerned about poverty in the Maritimes or in some parts of the west. If such people were placed on the board instead of some of the corporate elite, contact with the grass roots would be assured. Instead of making appointments from among the chambers of commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and so on, the appointments should be spread out so that there would be representation of the workingman on all boards, someone who has a sense of responsibility in relation to consumer affairs for instance. The appointments should be spread out instead of having this nonsense of political payola.

A previous hon. member, an ad man in Vancouver, a defeated Liberal in the last general election, should be like the rest of us and have to go out and earn a living; but he was appointed to the Tariff Board. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has ever seen a tariff or has ever opened a book on economics. He is a person farthest away from the grass roots than I have seen for a long time. I will

Crown Corporations

sit down before five o'clock, on my old principle of never talking out an hon. member's private motion. As I say, I am opposed to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull): Mr. Speaker, as usual this is a very interesting Friday afternoon.

First I would like to praise the efforts made by my friend from Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) in the course of his remarks. If one consults the index of *Hansard* for the last session, one finds an impressive list of bills introduced by the hon. member and all kinds of motions moved by him in the House, which is to his credit, showing that he is a truly good member, an excellent social organizer. But I wonder whether, in moving such a motion as the one now before us, he truly realizes its purpose, and I believe that the formula he uses is not quite the right one. What he wants is to have a certain right to examine and to check on the various government agencies and Crown corporations.

His objective is certainly not that formulated in his motion. But, we have means at our disposal to do that in committee. Indeed, in my opinion hon. members do not understand their role as members and, Mr. Speaker, as chairman of a committee, you know how that works. On some occasions, certain members do not know what their role is. Some would rather make headlines than really scrutinize the organization or administration of a Crown company. This should be done *in camera*; it would be much better. The newspapermen should be shooed out, and the merits of the questions to be put seriously discussed with the representatives or officials of the Crown companies.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to call it five o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): The hour appointed for consideration of private members' business has now expired. It being five o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 2(3), the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.