

stop producing it? Is he suggesting that all Canadians who have jobs in the production of that equipment should lose those jobs? If he is not suggesting that, what new rules is he proposing? Why will he and his Party, who have asked for new rules, not accept my invitation to come forward and help us draw up those new rules? Why, when we are working to bring in a new export controls policy, have we received only nine months of silence from members of the New Democratic Party? Are they interested only in making speeches in the House of Commons or are they prepared to respond positively to invitations to help formulate Canadian policy?

It is a very important matter that relates very directly to the question under debate here, because it is the easiest thing in the world merely to express opinions. All of us have been sent here with a much higher responsibility than just the expression of opinion. We are asked to bring about changes in the country. I have invited members of the New Democratic Party to participate in those changes. So far I have had only silence. When are they going to move away from the easy work of offering criticism and respond to the invitation to join in the hard work of actually defining new approaches that might be followed?

**Mr. Keeper:** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about export permits. It should be clear to the Hon. Minister that Canadians oppose the approval of export permits that allow equipment to go to a country like Chile to be used by the police forces for the repression of the efforts to return that country to democracy, that have been documented by Amnesty International as having involved torture and the deaths of citizens. The Minister talks about words, well, he has been using a lot of words here today. While he is using a lot of words, the Government, through export development grants, continues to subsidize sales that end up in countries like Chile. Why does the Minister not bring a stop to that?

• (1540)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this Bill because I and other members of my Party wish to raise a number of concerns. Hopefully, the Minister or other members of the Government will be forthcoming with some answers, perhaps during the question and comment period.

The concept of the divestiture of Canadian Crown corporations is not one to which I or my Party are opposed. However, there is a legitimate concern about the way in which that process operates. For instance, we must consider the buyer, Canadian versus non-Canadian, the price and the assets. We must consider the effect it may have on the workforce, and whether the pension plans of that workforce will be transferable. We must consider whether Parliament and Canadians have all of the facts surrounding a particular sale.

That is what is disturbing about the Government's refusal to place the Arthur Andersen Report before Parliament. It has been misleading, even if unintentional. This report on this

### *Canadian Arsenals Limited*

particular sale was financed through Government expenditures and we believe that Parliament and Canadians ought to know the contents of that report.

I am not suggesting that the successful bidder, SNC, is a bad company, because we know that it is a good Canadian company with an international reputation. However, let me refer to a letter dated January 20, 1986 written to the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. McInnes) from my colleague, the Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr. Boudria). The Minister responded by saying: "I cannot provide you with a copy of the Arthur Andersen Report". However, he does say in the letter, in a postscript: "I can show you a copy of the report in my office if you so wish". That is signed by the Minister.

Is this an example of the sort of tactics and practices of clandestine meetings that we saw some months ago, or was it a real attempt to provide legitimate information? If the information is confidential and of such a nature that it is of great embarrassment or detrimental to the security of the nation, perhaps that should be said. However, the Minister simply states: "I can show you a copy of the report in my office if you so wish". I suggest that Parliament has been prohibited from seeing the real information with regard to this particular Crown corporation.

Perhaps that SNC offer was the best possible selling price the Government could have received for this Crown corporation at that time. However, I have serious doubts about that based on information I have about another bidder in the process. These are facts which I have in my possession and I would be happy to respond to Ministers on the floor or in private if they have any questions.

This company, International Defence Products Limited, is as reputable as SNC, to my knowledge. It provided a bid to the divestiture project office in Ottawa. I have a letter dated September 11, 1985, in which it submitted its proposal.

While perhaps only the Minister of Supply and Services can comment, the transactions and communications which took place subsequent to its bid was very limiting, at best. I find that very surprising because this is an Ontario corporation, Canadian controlled and over 75 per cent Canadian owned. I believe it is a good corporate citizen.

Let me highlight some of the benefits that would flow had this company's bid been accepted. International Defence Products Limited is controlled and managed by Canadians. The initial value of the offer and the undertaking is far in excess of the selling price as referred to by the Government with regard to selling to SNC. Other benefits would include increased exports, increased employment in certain areas of the country, transfer of leading edge technology to Canada, major new investment and manpower training, an increase in continuing research and development expenditures, a world product mandate, three new industrial facilities, and increased corporate and personal tax revenue from new products.

Although many benefits would be provided to Canada, the germane question is what the company offered financially. We know that SNC paid \$87 million for the purchase of the shares