

or the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce? Is it a matter of their wanting to have it both ways?

**Mr. Breau:** That is a problem of Quebec.

**Mr. Broadbent:** The hon. member suggests this is a problem of the province of Quebec. Certainly it is partly a problem of the province of Quebec, but it was this government which made grants to that corporation, and it is this government that can now enforce certain conditions. That is exactly the attitude many have taken in respect of racism in South Africa, and it is similar to the kind of attitude taken toward Germany in the 1930s. This involves extricating oneself from a situation because of the legal niceties, but that is unacceptable. If we are to have nice speeches by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and others about our concerns in respect of problems within Canada, surely we cannot tolerate one of the business-oriented departments of the government taking the attitude toward corporations in Canada that they can do what they want with the people who work for them. I suggest that is a totally unacceptable attitude.

**Mr. Breau:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Broadbent:** Certainly.

**Mr. Breau:** Is the hon. member suggesting that whenever the government of Canada is dealing with a foreign corporation located in a province, it should have jurisdiction over the labour laws of that province or the collective agreements of the corporation?

**Mr. Broadbent:** By no means. If the hon. member had listened to what I said, he would know I suggested that in terms of grants provided by the federal government to corporations, it could set up minimum standards of behaviour, just as it did under the foreign takeover review legislation. It could set up certain standards of good corporate citizenship, and before a company received a grant from the people of Canada it would have to meet those decent, democratic and civilized standards or it would not get the grant. It seems to me that is precisely what this government is not doing, specifically in the United Aircraft case.

I come finally to my fourth concern. I do not anticipate this course of action—although the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said something outside the House today which suggested that the government might follow this path—but if the government should decide to nationalize the United Aircraft corporation, would it retain ownership of the patents which have resulted from Canadian research and development, or will the United Aircraft corporation be able to transfer production along with the patent rights to produce such engines in the United States, so that all that would be left in the hands of the Canadian government would be an empty factory?

My suspicion is that the latter will take place, that the Canadian taxpayer will be left with some concrete, some metal girders, and the workers with no work to do because the work and the jobs would have quite legally been shifted back to the United States. We do not know the answer to that question because the minister has not provided the members of this House or the public in

*The Address—Miss F. MacDonald*

general with the details of the contracts the government has entered into with the corporation.

I spoke a number of times in this House and outside, in 1970, about the federal government's research and development programs, stating that by giving about 80 per cent of such funds to foreign-owned companies, without having the stringent safeguards implicit in my remarks today, we as a country were simply financing growth in both technology and employment in the foreign countries concerned. We were not providing any permanent benefit for the people of Canada. I would ask whether the United Aircraft case is not a sad but profound example of more than \$100 million misspent.

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands):** First of all I should like to congratulate you, Sir, and through you the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) on assuming the high office of Speaker. I know that his qualities of fairmindedness, sound judgment and innate good humour will mark his tenure in office as our first commoner.

There have been a great number of interventions in this debate, many of a high calibre from new members of the House. The quality of these speeches is a clear reflection of the ability of men and women entering public life in Canada. Of all the interventions in this debate, perhaps understandably, that of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) drew the most critical comment.

His speech has been widely described as surprising because it was expected to deal with inflation. This was demanded by the situation. But the Prime Minister did not discuss the economic program of his government; he discussed bilingualism, constitutional patriation, reform of the procedures of the House of Commons, and amendments in respect of the tenure of members of the Senate.

The Prime Minister's speech should have come as no surprise. There was nothing puzzling about it. This was characteristic. This was the essential Trudeau. It was consistent with everything the Prime Minister has ever said about his priorities, or at least everything he said before the election of 1972.

The Prime Minister has always defined the problems of government as institutional problems. From 1968 to 1972 his main concerns were with the readjustment of constitutional relationships, the reform of parliament, and new techniques for decision making in the executive branch of government. The Prime Minister's commitment is not to the substance of public policy but to the reform of the institutional mechanisms by which policy is made.

● (1630)

It is the irony of his public career that he has made an obsession of his search for institutional rationality. He has an obsession with discovering and applying a scientific technique which will produce, in his words, "political instruments which are sharper, stronger and more finely controlled than anything based on mere emotionalism". Seen in this light the Prime Minister's speech ceases to be puzzling. Inflation did not receive serious attention in the Prime Minister's speech because it has never received serious attention in the Prime Minister's thought.