

[English]

The minister tells us he is introducing the changes to Bill C-105 to catch abusers of UIC. How is he going to penalize all those employers who are abusing the system?

Le Mouvement Action-Chômage tells us that 80 per cent of those people it assists win their appeals. That means employers have misrepresented the reasons people quit or were fired. How is picking on the victims going to halt the abuse by these employers?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** In answer to the hon. member's first question about withdrawing this bill, maybe the NDP member could tell Canadians how he expects to make up for the \$1 billion these people cost workers and employers. Maybe he would raise taxes, or maybe he would increase the deficit, the cherished way of the socialists. That is not our option. We have to live within our means.

As for employers, under the act if an employer gives false information on a record of employment, he is subjected to a fine of \$200 to \$5,000 and to an administrative penalty that can equal five times the amount of money the unemployed insured person can obtain. So it is quite a stiff penalty and employers are being prosecuted if they breach the act.

\* \* \*

#### MCDONNELL DOUGLAS

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Finance also concerns unemployment, in fact, the 3,700 workers at risk or already laid off at McDonnell Douglas Aircraft in Toronto.

When I last raised this question the government set up a committee to work with the company and the union. I want to now ask the government why this committee has not met since October. Why did the government cut back export development funding for this company in January? Is the government simply giving up on these 3,700 jobs or does it have some solution to offer to keep this high-tech company moving ahead in the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister for Science and Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows the tremendous array of

#### Oral Questions

export development programs the federal government has. Of course there are the recent announcements about the technology adaption programs, the extra \$400 million we are going to be putting into technology adaption and the \$240 million announced in the December 2 statement.

All those programs are there. I would be glad to look into the particular case the hon. member raises.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister.

On July 14, 1992 Boeing of Canada Limited wrote to the Prime Minister pointing out that no public bidding process had been initiated in the provision of equipment to meet Canada's search and rescue needs.

Boeing wrote that it had recently retrofitted 339 Labrador helicopters for the U.S. marines and navy. It reported to the Prime Minister that such a retrofit could be done on Canada's Labrador helicopters at a cost of \$10 million each and a savings of \$1 billion to the Canadian treasury.

In light of the information contained in this letter from Boeing Canada, why were no public tenders called? Why did the government not seek to save substantial sums of money in meeting Canada's search and rescue requirements?

• (1430)

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Boeing was invited to participate in the provision of new ship-borne aircraft and new search and rescue aircraft and in June 1990 submitted a bid which called for refurbishing the Labrador helicopters up to search and rescue requirements.

In today's dollars it represents about \$500 million to \$600 million to do it. We have to add to that the costs of spare parts and training equipment and the fact that we would then have two types of helicopters which would mean an additional \$275 million for the cost of this program. That particular option would cost about \$1.1 billion, leaving us with helicopters that were aged and therefore would not last as long, compared to \$800 million for the search and rescue function of the EH-101 helicopters.