

Government Organization

a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee we had the Canadian Overseas Telecommunications group appearing. This is another Crown corporation that is doing a good job, probably as good as any private industry would do it.

There will come a time when the Minister of Public Works will have to decide whether there are areas in public works that could be better handled by Crown corporations or whether they should remain under the ministry as is now the case. For that reason, all kinds of studies are made and all kinds of suggestions will be made to him in his capacity as minister. If an individual is making a recommendation to the ministry, he should have the protection of the privilege that he quite rightly would expect to be attached to it, namely, that it will not be made a public document unless it is considered in concert with all other documents.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that another of my colleagues wishes to speak on this motion, so I shall not talk until six o'clock.

Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me about a minute and a half. When I talk about the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) and his Socialist party, I have so much to say that I will say it in English, because that way I will go a little faster. When I read this Socialist party motion—

Mr. Gilbert: New Democratic Party.

Mr. Boulanger: I would rather call you Socialist because I do not know whether you are of the very far left or only half left. When I see a motion like this I know that the hon. member is still playing politics in this House, just as he does in his riding. He will never be in power in this House and therefore he need not be disappointed whether or not we pass this motion. But I doubt that we will pass it.

In his remarks the hon. member for Broadview talked about patronage, which he claimed was pretty high, but then he came down a little. However, Mr. Speaker, he forgot to mention how they get their money and how they make it—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the Chair.

[*English*]

I am sure that some hon. members who read this debate will feel that they should have been present with us. I would like to make one comment. This has been the twenty-sixth hour of private members' business in this session. I have listened to every debate during private members' hours, and all have been attended by a small number of members. I do not want to comment on the sum total of accomplishments during these 26 hours, which are the equivalent of 1½ weeks of government business, except to suggest that it might be worth while for some hon. members to get together to revise the rules.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[Mr. Cullen.]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**TEXTILE AND CLOTHING BOARD ACT**

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT, INQUIRIES, REPORTS, ADJUSTMENTS ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-215, to establish the Textile and Clothing Board and to make certain amendments to other acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I tried to rebut the amendment presented by the charming but sometimes bellicose hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Never!

Mr. Pepin: The amendment implies that the hon. member does not agree with the contents of clause 26 which amends the Export and Import Permits Act and provides that unilateral action to control imports taken with regard to textiles and clothing goods might also extend to other goods.

Mr. Baldwin: I admire the minister's perspicacity.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: Thank you very much. As I said this afternoon, we are not trying to hide anything. The title of the bill indicates that. I alluded to that on a number of occasions in my speeches in the House and in my answers to the committee. I was surprised that the opposition members of the committee did not give it more importance. Basing myself on comments that were made previously by members of the opposition, I assumed that this was acceptable and that they had no intention of opposing it. I think that was a logical conclusion.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It could have been raised by your own members.

Mr. Pepin: Yes, indeed. The principle that one should not amend other bills in a bill is new to me. Possibly the hon. member has some learned references to offer in support of his contention. As far as I know, it has been done before. It has been done in the present instance for everyone to see. I suggest it will also be done in the future. I cannot see how a major taxation bill, for example, could be introduced without making amendments to other existing bills. The practice seemed to be quite acceptable previously. I suggest that the amendment should be defeated, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): On this point, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why my colleague, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), has raised