

Adjournment Debate

marketing of complete aircraft, battlefield surveillance systems, and for specialized fabrication of major airframe assemblies for other prime aircraft manufacturers. The largest and most significant current project is the CL-600 Challenger corporate jet aircraft which offers a long-term potential for sales well in excess of \$1.6 billion. Contracted sales involving non-refundable deposits now number 120. Nothing said by this government at any time has ever been intended as any suggestion that we wish to jeopardize the future of that aircraft or that company.

As the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Stevens) has already indicated, what we have under active consideration is the feasibility of returning ownership of Canadair to the private sector. A special task force to deal specifically with both the framework to which the hon. member refers and, in this case, the specific privatization procedure for this company, has been established to study and to make recommendations on the process of privatization and on privatization guidelines. I would be more than happy to refer the hon. member's suggestions to that task force.

As I finish perhaps it should be clear that the reason this company was purchased was to make sure, as the hon. member suggests, that the company would remain in Canadian hands and that the people who work for it would continue to have their jobs. It was clearly understood at the time that government ownership was seen as temporary, until the company could be returned to private sector ownership as a successful, ongoing entity with sound, long-term prospects in its business and market area. The timing and character of a sale to the private sector can be expected not to prejudice the encouraging commercial performance of Canadair which has been built up during the period of government ownership. Moreover, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) indicated to this House, the retention of major facilities in Quebec will be an important consideration.

Finally, I think we on this side of the House clearly reject the suggestion that merely because something has been government-owned, it ought automatically to continue to be government-owned. This is fundamental to the success of the companies themselves in the long run.

● (2210)

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—GOVERNMENT POLICY
RESPECTING DISPOSAL AND TRANSPORTATION OF CHEMICAL
WASTES

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Bird's Hill): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Fraser) for taking the time to show up tonight to respond to the elaboration of my question.

If hon. members recall, the question I asked last Friday had to do with the disposal and transport of dangerous chemical wastes. Being a rookie I made the mistake of ending my question with a specific question to which the minister replied—and I was glad he replied as he did—“Yes, and soon;” that the government would proceed with the passage of the transport of dangerous goods legislation.

[Mr. Bosley.]

However, my question was prefaced with a more general question as to what the general intentions of the government were with regard to the transport and disposal of dangerous chemical wastes. I refer to the general problem of the growing number of dangerous products in Canada, a problem which we have not had to face up to until recently because, until recently, the United States was willing to take all of our chemical wastes and dispose of them for us.

However, the United States will be a garbage can for Canada for only so long, and its authorities have indicated that there is a limit to the time that they will receive these wastes from us, so we are faced with the prospect of having to build disposal plants on our side of the border.

I was first made aware of this problem when I was on a tour with the hon. member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) regarding health care. We happened into Fort Saskatchewan, north of Edmonton, where one of these plants is being suggested.

With regard to this general problem and with regard to the philosophical commitment of the government, I would like to ask the minister whether the government intends, as a policy, to allow the disposal of chemical wastes to be handled by the private sector or the public sector. One of the things a citizens' group in Fort Saskatchewan was concerned about was that the disposal of chemical wastes would be left to the private sector and that there were no incentives, once the chemical wastes were in the hands of a private company given this responsibility, to dispose of the chemical wastes in a safe and responsible way. Certain abuses have already been brought to our attention. These abuses have been by companies which have offered to dispose of waste, and then leaked these dangerous wastes on highways from leaking trucks, and carried out various other atrocities.

So, I would like to ask the minister what the general intention and policy of the government is with regard to this problem. I know the minister takes the problem seriously. I do not see this question as an attempt to embarrass the government, but I think it important that we know now just what the intention of the government is. Is this problem to be handled through public enterprise or through private enterprise? I myself feel that the latter alternative is a dangerous one.

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, since this matter falls primarily within the jurisdiction of the Department of Transport, I am taking the liberty of responding to the hon. member's concerns.

● (2215)

First, let me remind the hon. member that a bill to regulate the transportation of regulated goods is in fact included in the list of some of the measures the government proposes to place before Parliament during this first session of the Thirty-first Parliament and which the President of Privy Council (Mr. Baker) tabled in the House, Thursday, October 11. In case the