

the amendment to clause 27 deals specifically with manufactured goods. Would processed apples that are used in making apple juice qualify as manufactured goods? I do not think they would.

I point out that this federal government offered the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association, which is a co-operative growers association, something like \$400,000 if they would just forget certain of their problems. That offer would have cost the organization money. The B.C. Fruit Growers' Association stated that they could not accept the offer because it would have cost them \$700,000. It is ironic, also, that the minister who ought to pilot this bill through the House has left the Chamber.

Mr. Pepin: I am here.

Mr. Horner: I apologize to the minister. He has seen fit to sit with an hon. member on this side of the House, and I overlooked him.

Some hon. Members: Order.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: I thought the hon. member would see the light and join a free trade party in the right sense, a party determined to forward Canadian interests, which would lead him to improving our society economics. However, we are blindly asked to protect whatever manufacturing industry might foreseeably need protection in the future.

I grew up in the west. Throughout the years farm organizations have stated that periodically they have to protect the large manufacturing industries in the east without receiving any protection themselves. On every occasion when manufacturing industries have put forward their case it has been made public. However, under clauses 26 and 27 of this bill it does not have to be made public. The minister is nodding his head in the affirmative. I take it he agrees that this protection does not have to be made public. That is not right.

Bill C-215 is entitled "An act to establish the Textile and Clothing Board". Tied on as a rider is the following:

—and to make certain amendments to other acts in consequence thereof

Is the shoe industry "in consequence thereof"? Is a whole host of other industry "in consequence thereof" and may it be brought in under clauses 26 and 27 unknown to the public, as pointed out by the hon. member for Peace River? That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. It may be correct in a legalistic and Parliamentary sense. However, in a country that is striving to protect our solidity and forces are working to unite us, it is not correct. If unity is the question, it is not morally correct.

Mr. Pepin: You made that speech this afternoon.

Mr. Horner: I hear some comments from the minister. I appreciate them. I do not care how many times I make the speech. What is important is how many times the speech registers in the mind of the minister.

Mr. Pepin: It obviously has, if I can recall it.

Textile and Clothing Board Act

Mr. Horner: The minister says it obviously has. In addition to registering in the mind of the minister, I want it to register in the minds of the Canadian public.

Mr. Pepin: They are all as intelligent as I am.

Mr. Horner: I believe in democracy. The Canadian people must know what their government is doing. If the government is dealing in secret or unknown to the public, there is no difference between that kind of government and a dictatorship. By including everything within the scope of clause 27 the government is attempting to hide something from the public. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary sits here without commenting. He said in committee that this heralds a marked change. He acknowledges the fact that this heralds a marked change in Canada's assistance to manufacturing industries.

Where are we going, Mr. Speaker? Are we going to create a climate in which the manufacturing industry in central Canada will have more protection than the part of the country which is rich in raw materials? The country is regionally divided so that some areas have little or limited manufacturing industry. Are we prepared to sacrifice the raw materials in those areas for the manufacturing industries of other areas? The minister is making light of this argument.

Mr. Pepin: I am admiring your histrionics.

Mr. Horner: The minister is making light of this.

An hon. Member: It is too big a word for him.

Mr. Horner: Histrionics is not too big a word for me. I heard it but I paid no attention to it. The minister made light of the argument I was putting forward. That will not endear him to western Canada. The regions of this country are divided. Western Canada is rich in raw materials and eastern Canada is rich in manufactured goods. As a representative of western Canada, I say that clause 27 will provide protection for any and all manufactured goods.

The minister went to great lengths this afternoon to explain the textile board. He is not necessarily knowledgeable on textiles and many other things. After the full explanation on all aspects of the bill, clauses 26 and 27—in particular, by the hon. member for Peace River, I know why there will be the appointment of three persons who are not necessarily knowledgeable on textiles but are knowledgeable on all manufactured goods. This is a radical change in the Liberal party. Up until this time the Liberal party has been able to successfully advocate in western Canada that they are the party of free trade. After the passage of this bill, the government will never be able to convince me or anyone within the sound of my voice—

An hon. Member: That is quite a distance.

Mr. Horner: —that they are the party of free trade. No member of the Liberal party can successfully argue that clause 27 should include all goods other than textiles and clothing. No person can successfully argue that point