

*Oral Questions*

policy, while the others are not official representatives of any sports body, nor have they any connection with the South African Government.

We will continue with our vigorous policy of opposition to apartheid in ways that are effective about the world and in the Commonwealth, as I have said just a few minutes ago. The Secretary of State has also initiated a further review of this situation to see what changes might be necessary in the particular regulations as they apply to sports. He is doing this in co-ordination with the Minister of State for Youth.

## GLENEAGLES AGREEMENT

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, this vigorous application of the Gleneagles Agreement has led to more South African athletes being admitted into Canada since this Government came to office than previously. The Government continues to apply the policy of the previous Government that allows certain athletes such as tennis players and golfers to come into the country as entrepreneurs, but excludes a South African softball player who came merely as an individual observer and not a representative. I ask the Minister again if this Government will now implement in its policy the entirety of the Gleneagles Agreement and ban access by all South African athletes to this country, as the world demands?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting at sometime if the hon. gentlemen could be factual in their questions. The suggestion in this question is that more South African athletes have been admitted to Canada, presumably to play at their particular sport, in the last four years than in the previous four years.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Three.

**Mr. Crosbie:** He wants to narrow it to three. Let's have some facts from the hon. gentleman. I do not think what he alleges to be fact is fact. Our policy is clear. Our policy is in accordance with other Commonwealth countries. The Secretary of State for External Affairs is reviewing it now, and when he has finished his review we will see whether he thinks changes are needed or not.

\* \* \*

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

## ACQUISITION OF ALL-TERRAIN TROOP CARRIERS

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence who has found an excellent election tool in the Department of National Defence.

The Minister and some of his colleagues were really grasping when they dashed out to Calgary last week to announce the building of 820 all-terrain troop carriers at a

greatly inflated cost, and the company will not even begin to retool its plant until 1992. Two elections could be over in Canada by that time.

The damning thing about the Government's action was the ignoring of the tendering process on defence contracts in Canada. Why was no other company in Canada given the chance to bid on this contract? Why was a Request for Proposal not sent out to other potential bidders? And, simply, why was there no tender whatsoever on this whole \$420 million defence contract? You are not protecting the taxpayers of this country.

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, if the Department of National Defence has become a good election vehicle for the Government, it is because it was ignored for 20 years by the Liberal Government of the time.

What we are doing is keeping a promise that was made to the men and women serving in Canada's Armed Forces to re-equip the Armed Forces of Canada after 20 years of neglect.

The Canadian Forces already have over 100 of these vehicles. These vehicles are used by our allies with whom we would have to be working in Norway. They are used as well by our ally, the United States, in Alaska. No other existing vehicle is for sale in Canada which meets the requirements of the Canadian Forces. If we were to ask that some be designed, we would have to start from scratch at considerably greater cost. That would result in orphaning the existing vehicles which are compatible and interchangeable with allied equipment, and we would drive up the cost to the Canadian taxpayers. If that is what the Hon. Member is suggesting, let him say so directly.

## COST OF VEHICLES

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, that is rather odd. Maybe the Minister could explain why he is paying almost triple the cost for the same vehicles he bought between 1984 and 1987? Why the greatly inflated cost if this was all so handy, with no added expenses?

The Minister is going to need vehicles for the militia training centres in Canada. The Government has suggested that it may go sole source for those purchases as well, which means no tendering. When is this Government going to stop ignoring the tendering system and put some integrity and fairness back into the defence purchasing of this country instead of using the same old slogans? The Minister stands up on his feet and uses his rhetoric instead of telling the taxpayers of Canada why their money is not being well spent under the tendering system for defence projects.

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, do I understand correctly that it is the position of the Liberal Party of Canada that we should break this agreement with Canadian Foremost Ltd. of Calgary and say that the contracts should be given to somebody else? If that is the