

*Oral Questions*

It apparently has millions of dollars for this luxury plane to be used for, it hopes, ferrying around the Minister of National Defence and other Conservative bigwigs, but it has nothing for the unemployed, nothing for the poor, nothing for social housing, in other words nothing for the 1.5 million Canadians who have been suffering because of this Conservative government's policies.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, is the position of Liberals that the Department of National Defence should not have a fleet of aircraft to transport personnel and equipment when needed, when they need to go to peacekeeping missions and so on? If that is the position let them honestly take it.

If it is the position that DND should have them, I am sure the member would recognize that it is important they be outfitted to carry cargo and passengers. He talks about millions of dollars. Perhaps he would be interested to know that in fact to outfit the planes for passengers costs \$2 million and the one with the executive suite, \$2.5 million. Hardly the extravagant, multimillion dollar expenditure he is talking about.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West):** Madam Speaker, the minister has not given an explanation that will be accepted by any reasonable Canadian as to why he and the Minister of National Defence and this government authorized the expenditure, he admits, of \$2.5 million for a luxury plane, permanently outfitted with an executive board-room and a deluxe bathroom and shower.

The only people who will take a bath with this plane are Canadian taxpayers, and they have already suffered enough under the Conservative government.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, none of my notes or any explanation has suggested there is this luxury bathtub he is talking about. There will be a toilet. There is one on most planes. As a matter of fact there is apparently a small shower as well.

• (1425)

Let me repeat again. Perhaps he did not hear me. To outfit the planes, to put in the modifications to carry cargo, is about \$14 million per plane. To outfit them for

passengers is \$2 million per plane. This one is \$2.5 million. Yes, it costs \$500,000 more to have one plane that is capable of taking the Governor General and Her Majesty the Queen.

In other words it could have been paid for if the hon. member when he was minister had taken the Challenger about 20 fewer times than he actually took it.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I would appreciate hearing what the next member has to say.

\* \* \*

**STEEL INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. It concerns yesterday's steel ruling by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal.

The government signed a free trade agreement and the Canadian steel industry lost. That was not a surprise. We proposed a bilateral steel agreement. The Americans rejected it. That was a loss for Canadian steel. We were not surprised. The American Trade Commission ruled against the Canadian steel industry last month, imposed duties of 60 per cent, and we lost. That was no surprise.

However when our own Canadian International Trade Tribunal rules that six countries are dumping steel in Canada but not injuring our steel industry we lose again. We are surprised and we are shocked.

Is the minister prepared to implement changes in Canadian trade law that will offer Canadian steel producers support rather than abandonment?

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Madam Speaker, at least my hon. friend from the NDP is asking a substantive question about something that affects Canadians. Unfortunately he is really stretching when he tries to tag this one to the free trade agreement.

The reality of the situation is that the trade tribunal is an independent body at arm's length from the government. Perhaps it is the suggestion of my hon. friend and his party that this government should interfere with the objective findings of independent bodies. Maybe he would like us to interfere with the courts as well. However that is not the process.