

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Broadbent:** The Prime Minister knows as well as anyone else that, according to the process mentioned in the budget—and I assume he is now being corrected by one of his Ministers—a number of companies will be exempt from review. That can only mean one thing—a weakening of FIRA, and the Prime Minister should acknowledge it.

• (1430)

## LAY-OFFS ANNOUNCED BY FOREIGN-OWNED COMPANIES

**Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, we have seen just in recent weeks that foreign-owned firms certainly do not have a commitment to jobs in Canada. For instance, the Iron Ore Company in Quebec has laid off hundreds of workers, and Bowater in Newfoundland has also laid off hundreds of workers. Both companies have made millions of dollars in profits. Considering this is the reality about the performance of such companies in Canada, will the Prime Minister implement what he promised, not only in the 1980 election campaign but also in the last Throne Speech, that is, to bring measures before the House specifically designed to strengthen FIRA?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the examples which the Hon. Member gives are somewhat misleading. It is obvious that some foreign-owned companies are laying off workers, but so are Canadian-owned companies. Strengthening FIRA now would do nothing about the specific cases he quotes.

**Mr. Broadbent:** What about the next ones, though?

**Mr. Trudeau:** The next ones, Madam Speaker, I have dealt with in answering the Hon. Member's two previous questions.

**Mr. Broadbent:** No.

**Mr. Trudeau:** We are not weakening FIRA. We are making it more efficient. Increasing the threshold above which companies are examined for their investment intentions does not mean that we change the spirit of FIRA; it means that we will be able to deal with the important and the big cases more expeditiously. That is the object of it.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Black is white, too.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## THE CONSTITUTION

## QUEBEC'S RIGHT OF VETO—GOVERNMENT POSITION

**Mr. Dennis Dawson (Louis-Hébert):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. In its decision on Monday, the Supreme Court of Canada rejected the appeal launched by Quebec in which it claimed to have a veto right. As a result, a number of Quebecers again have the feeling they were betrayed by the other provinces and the

Federal Government. Can the Prime Minister inform the House whether the case is closed or whether the Federal Government can be expected to reiterate the offer made in Victoria and rejected by Quebec, and rejected by Quebec once again during the last round of constitutional talks? And now that the courts have dealt with the case, is the political debate expected to resume, and is there a chance that the subject will be put on the agenda of the Constitutional Conference that is already scheduled, in order to prove to Quebecers that the Federal Government is still interested in this matter?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, regarding the second half of the question, the provinces are aware that the Constitutional Conference next March will be held specifically to discuss matters relating to native peoples. The agenda is open, and officials from the various provincial governments and our federal officials are now trying to determine the items that will be put on the agenda, which means that the provinces are free to make suggestions for discussing various constitutional matters, including the amending formula. I do not know whether the Government of the Province of Quebec, after abandoning its veto right, will now try to get it back.

**Mr. La Salle:** It never had one, according to the Supreme Court's decision!

**Mr. Trudeau:** The Member for Joliette says that it never had one. It never had one because it never wanted one. The Member for Joliette ought to know that at least since 1968, our Government has been trying to get an amending formula that would have given Quebec a legal veto right. We did this because we wanted it to be enshrined in the Constitution. However, in April 1981 the Parti Québécois Government joined the other provinces in saying that all provinces should be treated the same, and the party to which my hon. colleague, the Member for Joliette, belongs, fought the Government's draft proposal for a veto right and prevented its approval by the House. The Hon. Member and his leader have prevented Quebec from getting a veto right by fighting against our proposal, which contained a veto right.

\* \* \*

[English]

## NATIONAL SECURITY

## CASE OF CANADIAN PROFESSOR—TRANSMISSION OF NATO SECRETS

**Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. In an article in this morning's *Citizen* written by Neil Macdonald, it is reported:

Tuesday, Solicitor General Robert Kaplan and Justice Minister Mark MacGuigan admitted Hambleton did tell the Mounties about passing on the NATO documents—