

*Adjournment Debate***PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION***[English]*

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. John Brewin (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to elaborate for a few minutes on a question which I asked the other day in respect of the government's proposed purchase of \$4.3 billion "worth" of anti-submarine and search and rescue helicopters.

The government's proposal is to buy 35 EH-101 helicopters, which are basically British helicopters, for anti-submarine purposes, and 15 of the same helicopters to be equipped for search and rescue purposes. These are to replace the current Sea King helicopters that are used on board our ships for anti-submarine and other purposes, and the 12 land-based Labradors which are used for search and rescue.

We have heard now from the Associate Minister of National Defence and from the Prime Minister that no decision has yet been officially made. What we have seen is that the Department of National Defence has made a very clear and specific recommendation to proceed with these helicopters.

We have also had the privilege of reading correspondence from the chief of the air services, Lieutenant-General Huddleston, and the commanding officer of air transportation who have really not criticized the idea of modernizing the current fleet, but rather said they do not want to proceed with that until the proposed purchase of new helicopters has at least been tested on cabinet.

Cabinet has before it now the possibility of a decision on this helicopter proposal. In the House, the ministers responsible have ducked the question of whether they are actually going to recommend it. In fact, today the Associate Minister of National Defence said that no decision had yet been made, no recommendation had gone forward.

I would like to say on behalf of the people of Canada that the government has to not only look carefully at this proposal, but ought in the general interest decide now that this proposal should not be proceeded with.

It allows CMHC to supply services to support federal-provincial housing arrangements in a cost-effective manner, so it gets us into that area as well. It makes it clear that Canada Mortgage and Housing may charge fees for these services.

I cannot see us, to use the vernacular, soaking non-profit housing groups or co-ops, but there may be certain services that we have that we could assist them with for a modest charge.

I will check with my officials here but I do not think there is any schedule of fees or any plans have been made. It is an enabling provision.

Clause 49 agreed to.

Clauses 50 to 52 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 53—*Coming into force*

Mr. Joe Fontana (London East): On a technical point. I know that clause 53(2) makes revised CMHC income tax status effective January 1, 1991. That was one and a half years ago.

I know that clause 53(3) talks about ceilings on the insurance and the MBS guarantees effective January 1, 1992. Is January 1, 1991 the date? It is about a year and one-half too late.

• (2200)

Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works): I will put it again in the vernacular if I may. That is the deal that has been made with finance, basically. That is the arrangement that has been made. It is part of the discussions.

Mr. Fontana: Not to hold it up here but perhaps I would be interested to see in the financial figures why finance would have wanted it on January 1, 1991. Perhaps that information could be provided to the Senate when it is reviewing this bill as well.

Mr. MacKay: That certainly could be arranged. My colleague at finance is very benevolent in this regard and I am sure he did it for our own best interests.

Clause 53 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed.