

Employment Support Bill

harm the competitive spirit of these companies. I am sure that all Canadians are concerned to see whether or not the money given to Canadian plants once this bill is passed is being invested in the best interests of Canadians. To talk of disclosure of this information doing harm to the competitive position of these companies is just not good enough.

The amendment that my colleague has moved clearly spells out those areas in which there should be public disclosure. In our opinion it is not good enough to tell the unemployed that their money is being spent for the benefit of a company in some other country. Neither is it good enough to state that the branch plant economy that we have is entitled to receive assistance when not one job opportunity will be created.

Surely the minister could find his way clear to accepting this amendment. It is not so far-reaching as to harm the position of companies in the event of public disclosure. My colleague has made it clear that he is not going to ask for the world; all he wants is public disclosure of employment levels at the beginning and end of the assistance period. Level of employment is something that we in this House should be concerned about. Clearly, the United States is hell bent on a program of keeping everything within their own boundary. Our obligation is to protect employment in Canada and investments made by taxpayers in various corporations.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this amendment this evening.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: We will let you know whether you should have spoken later.

Mr. Rose: Earlier in the evening I was invited by the ranks of the government backbenches to review a scholarly publication known as "Fuddle-duddle", and while over there perusing this magazine, which I think is volume 1, No. 2—

Mr. Alexander: Is No. 2 out now?

Mr. Rose: It is out now—I noticed some consternation among the ranks of government members who were calling for the House leader, the fire department and every other facility that might assist them, since they seemed to feel at that time that the extent of this debate on the amendment before the House was more than they had anticipated.

Mr. Baldwin: They should know better by now.

Mr. Rose: I am afraid I did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. Baldwin: I said, they should know better by now.

Mr. Rose: Let me say to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) who said, "They should know better by now", in case the *Hansard* reporter did not write it down, that they have a learning block. Unfortunately, under the kind of system that we have, which is the adversary system that we have inherited from our progenitors, the British, only the government have men of enlightenment. I see the Gallic minister of Industry, Trade

and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) looking at me at the mention of the British.

Mr. Pepin: Do I have a choice?

Mr. Rose: Although I did not hear what he said either, the smiling minister has a favourite phrase which is, "It takes two to tangle". I would invite him to tangle now. If he would like me to repeat what I said earlier, I will be pleased to oblige and then he could repeat what he said.

Mr. Pepin: That would be a pleasure. The hon. member said I was looking at him, to which I said that I did not have a choice because he had the floor.

Mr. Rose: The minister says he has no choice but to look at me. But when my deskmate, my old buddy from Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg), was speaking a minute ago, the minister did have a choice. However, in complete defiance of the policies of his colleague the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro), I saw the minister out in the hallway having a cigarette. He was not looking at anybody but the hon. member for New Westminister (Mr. Hogarth).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Mr. Rose: In spite of the fact that the hon. member for New Westminister—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair hesitates to allow the hon. member to pursue his remarks, but it is very difficult to relate the last few sentences to the motion now before the House. The hon. member should try to get back to the motion before the House, which is to amend clause 21 of the bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rose: I sympathize with Your Honour in trying to thread your way through the excursions and intricacies of this debate. I had a similar problem a little earlier and was deflected somewhat by the question of the minister. It would seem to me the minister should try to "home in" on the real essence—the nub, if you like—of the argument, instead of being distracted and diverted by every kind of irrelevancy and frivolity. In any event, I will do my best to get back to the point.

• (9:10 p.m.)

My colleague, the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent), who is looking very unhappy at the moment, put forward a sincere amendment. His amendment called upon the government, which is spending public funds, hopefully in the interests of the Canadian worker, to disclose the recipients of these funds on a monthly basis. It is very important that any recipient of public funds, whether they be corporations, municipalities or unions, should disclose the source of these public funds and show what has been done with them. They should be willing and eager to do so. This is only sensible, and I have no objection to the suggestion. We must decide whether we are living and operating in a closed or an open society. Hopefully, in an open society all things are placed on the table and nothing is too private to be revealed to a public which is charged with paying the shot for all of us.

Mr. Saltzman: Keep the state out of the bedroom.