

that, far from complying with the principle at one time enunciated by the Auditor General, the government is trying to do the opposite. It does not intend to follow those principles. I will elaborate on this in the few minutes available to me.

The point at issue is that the people of Canada, through parliament, have provided between \$80 million and \$120 million, depending on what figures you use, to United Aircraft Corporation of Longueuil, Quebec. That this company used this money positively, no one will deny. The company developed in Canada two excellent aircraft engines which have sold remarkably well at home and abroad.

That company also happens to be one of the most vicious anti-labour companies in North America—by which I mean in Canada and in the United States. It has an absolutely deplorable record in its dealings with its working staff, as evidenced by the strike which has gone on for more than a year and a half at Longueuil, Quebec. The company's employees have been on strike for that period.

The members of the New Democratic Party, reflecting the concern of the people of Longueuil, say that the company was using money provided by the people of Canada and that the company was able to prolong the strike because nothing in the contract entered into between the company and the government prohibited that company from transferring work, financed by the people of Canada, to the United States. That is precisely what the company did during the strike. The hon. member who just spoke acknowledged that the work which was sent to the United States and was supposed to have been done in Canada will not be repatriated fully to Canada until late in 1976.

**An hon. Member:** Shame!

**Mr. Broadbent:** That work, transferred out of Canada during the strike, enabled the company to prolong the strike, and enabled the company more readily to implement its profoundly anti-labour policy.

When we asked for the contracts and correspondence to be tabled, we wanted to know if there was anything in those contracts which would prohibit this course of action. We discovered in the contracts, and in the information that was provided to us, that there was no protection for Canadian workers. There was no protection either for the taxpayers of Canada who had put up the money.

We also wanted to look at the correspondence entered into between the Government of Canada and the company. And here let me say I share the hon. member's view, and the view of the government. If there are matters of a confidential nature the disclosure of which could jeopardize the company's commercial competitive position in the economy, or impair its ability to compete with other aircraft manufacturers, those matters ought to be kept confidential. But that position does not justify the total refusal to reveal any correspondence. Presumably a good part of it in the last year and a half dealt with the strike.

Surely the minister or other members of the government wrote to the company, and surely there were replies regarding the company's attitude to that strike. Surely there was some discussion about the obligations of that company to Canadian workers it was employing. But our

### United Aircraft

requests were met with a blanket refusal. The minister refused to provide us with any correspondence.

I repeat that, if information can hurt the company's competitive position, it ought to be kept confidential. But we do not accept the attitude that the people of Canada have no right to know anything concerning the spending of amounts in the neighbourhood of \$100 million put up by the taxpayer. We feel we have the right to know, on behalf of the taxpayer, what went on during any discussions. Specifically, we seek information in relation to workers at Longueuil, Quebec, who were adversely affected during the past one and a half years, and continue to be adversely affected. Therefore we do not accept the government's attitude, and we intend to force a vote on this important issue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Those in favour of the motion will please say, yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Those opposed will please say, nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** In my opinion, the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Broadbent) which was negated on the following division:

### (Division No. 62)

#### YEAS

#### Messrs.

Alkenbrack	Ellis	Kempling
Allard	Elzinga	Knowles
Baker	Epp	(Winnipeg North Centre)
(Grenville-Carleton)	Forrestall	Knowles
Beaudoin	Friesen	(Norfolk-Haldimand)
Benjamin	Gilbert	Laprise
Blackburn	Gillies	La Salle
Brewin	Grafftey	Lawrence
Brisco	Halliday	Leggatt
Broadbent	Hamilton	MacKay
Cadieu	(Swift Current- Maple Creek)	Macquarrie
Clarke	Hargrave	Malone
(Vancouver Quadra)	Hnatyshyn	Masniuk
Crouse	Holmes	McCain
Darling	Horner	McCleave
Dick	Huntington	McGrath
Douglas	Jelinek	McKenzie
(Nanaimo-Cowichan- The Islands)	Johnston	Muir