

*The Address—Mr. Broadbent*

terms of providing any effective assurances that work will be continued in Canada.

In the first substantive paragraph of the letter, which is the second paragraph, the head of the company assures the minister that it will begin to repatriate the work from the United States which they had already sent out of Canada, as rapidly as possible "consistent with maintaining an orderly flow of engines to our customers". That kind of qualification in the opening part of the letter is such that if they produced no more engines at all in Canada next year, they could refer back to this letter and say, "Well, we warned you in advance that it might not be possible".

Given the attitude that I referred to a minute ago toward its employees, and the fact that the company is totally unwilling to accept the Rand formula, I think it is beyond question that the company expects to break that union. It expects to break the labour force at Longueuil either entirely or to reduce it substantially to the point of having almost no economic significance for Canada.

Let me repeat that two days before this letter was sent to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, an official of the same company said in Montreal, on Wednesday last, that the company planned a 35 per cent reduction in their production in Canada next year. Surely that is a flat contradiction of the stated general purposes enunciated in the letter to the minister.

I want to raise some questions, Mr. Speaker, which have been unanswered so far in this House, and unanswered by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and other cabinet ministers outside the House—questions that require an answer. First of all, how was it possible for United Aircraft to transfer the production of engines and associated technology created by Canadian scientists and technicians, and largely financed by the taxpayers of Canada, from Canada to the United States in the first place? Were there no safeguards to protect this investment by the people of Canada? If there were no safeguards, then there ought to have been. On the other hand, if there were, then why were these safeguards not enforced during the past nine months?

It seems to me self-evident that if the people of Canada are going to put up \$105 million for a private corporation that is foreign-owned and produces products in its own country, we must ultimately have the assurance that the product will be produced in Canada. Judging from the transfer by the United Aircraft corporation of production to the United States during the past nine months, there were no safeguards at all in the contracts. I repeat, I do now know whether there were or not, and the government has not made the contracts available so we can find out. If there were safeguards, why was no action taken to stop this transfer of production?

My second question is: when did the government request United Aircraft to give assurances about its production plans in Canada for next year? This transfer of production has been going on for many months now. When did the minister really become involved in a serious way? Was it last week, after questions were asked in the House? Did he phone the president, who is an old friend, Mr. Stephenson—I understand they are good buddies—and get him to send off a letter to the minister because the matter might come up again in the House of Commons? Or did

[Mr. Broadbent.]

the minister become involved last month or six months ago? Surely this question is a relevant one.

If production has been lost to Canada and we have lost many jobs in the last few months, then surely the minister responsible for this program has an obligation to intervene. I now ask the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, when did he first go to the company for assurances about repatriating these jobs back to Canada? Related is the question, does the minister intend to reply to the letter he received from Mr. Stephenson asking for specific dollar commitments for next year? Never mind the general commitment of the company to do whatever it can. Surely, if the people of Canada are putting hundreds of millions of dollars into this corporation, the least we can expect is a dollars and cents commitment on the part of the corporation in terms of its plans for next year. Surely, the minister should not be satisfied with a letter written in general terms but should require the company to indicate that it plans to spend so many dollars in rebuilding the line and in producing a certain number of engines. This kind of specific detail is required and it is up to the minister to get back to the company to obtain that kind of assurance.

● (1620)

The third question that bothers me is a general one and involves the government's attitude toward working people in general. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said outside the House today that it did not matter to him—this is the logic of his argument—what kind of labour conditions prevailed in companies doing business with the government of Canada. The logic of his statement would seem to be that it did not matter if a company that was receiving millions of dollars in government grants had a profoundly anti-labour attitude, because this was not the minister's private domain; but, rather,—his domain was to ensure, or encourage the production of engines. I say that is a totally unacceptable attitude.

We passed legislation just a week ago which on the whole was equitable in terms of settling the grain handlers' dispute in western Canada. At that time certain ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) and the minister responsible for the Wheat Board (Mr. Lang), made very fine speeches which sounded good in terms of their interest in the working people of Canada and the conditions under which they laboured. Yet today we have a minister of the Crown stating that in terms of our dealings with corporations and, I repeat, in giving those corporations millions of dollars, it really did not matter what kind of labour circumstances their employees lived in or worked under. I say that is totally unacceptable. By that I do not mean that the government of the day can be held responsible for every semi-colon or comma written into a labour agreement. That is not the point. What it can do is adopt certain minimum standards and make sure that any company which is a beneficiary of public funds at least meets those standards. Surely one of the standards must be that a corporation as anti-labour as the United Aircraft corporation should not receive financial assistance from the people of Canada unless it changes its attitude toward its own employees.

I would ask you, Madam Speaker, who speaks for the government in these matters: is it the Minister of Labour,