

*Oral Questions*

yours, not mine—if we're not going to work in the spirit of trust and co-operation we've got a major problem”.

We have a major problem. When will this minister apologize to Ty Lund for her misrepresentation of his remarks?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in June Ty Lund gave an interview to Vicki Barnett of a newspaper in Alberta in which he said, and this is his quote in June in reference to the meeting that took place: “Referring to federal minister Copps, Lund said, ‘Come on, lady, if you want to come to Alberta and see what’s happening with Indian reserves and logging, we would have had it shut down and charged them a long time ago. Where have you been? In our last meeting with Sheila Copps—she’s an interesting lady—she was giving me the gears for trying to get into a harmonization. She sput and sputtered about that one and she said to me, ‘You don’t look after our lands’. Lund is leading the charge which would see the province have complete responsibility for Alberta land while Ottawa would oversee national parks and Indian reserves”.

Those were the comments of Mr. Lund in a newspaper interview in June.

**Mr. Solberg:** So what?

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** Apologize.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, those comments are absolutely true. That is the jurisdiction of the federal government. Why does she not live up to it and make sure it is abided by?

She accuses the provincial minister of saying this and exactly this: “You can have the national parks and the Indians. We want to look after all the rest”. That simply is not true. He did not say that. Regardless of what comments may have been taken out of context in that news article, why will she not—

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

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, I read from a transcript, not a newspaper article.

**Ms. Clancy:** Table it.

**Miss Grey:** When will the minister admit that is simply not what he said and when will she retract these remarks and get these talks back on track?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the other day the member claimed that I had misrepresented the views of Mr. Lund. Mr. Lund has never denied making the remarks at a private meeting with nine other ministers at which I heard very specifically the comments he made.

It is a sad day when the member for Beaver River gets up in the House and repeats the position of the Alberta government

that the Government of Canada has no place in Alberta other than to deal with Indian reserves and national parks.

Surely the Canadian people support a national government that will establish national environmental standards and give some national leadership. Surely she understands that the point I was making to Ty Lund, when I would not cave in to his blatant threat to tell me to get out of the province, was specifically because I believe, and the Government of Canada believes, that the people of Canada expect Canadian environmental leadership.

\* \* \*

• (1450)

[Translation]

## INDUSTRY CANADA

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

The secret document prepared for Operation Unity shows that the federal government is set to spend \$5.6 billion on the potential acquisition of defence equipment, including armoured vehicles, submarines and helicopters. According to the document, these equipment acquisition contracts could have a profound impact on Quebec businesses. The document identifies eight Quebec businesses likely to benefit economically and outlines the political views of their top executives.

How should we describe the federal government’s behaviour in dangling in front of some businesses generous contracts in return for their support for the No side? Is this not pure blackmail?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, again, the opposition’s allegations are totally unfounded.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition made comments to the press, which were reported by Hugh Winsor and which indicate that there is absolutely nothing to support his allegations and no evidence whatsoever that any company has been subjected to pressure.

In fact, as far as the defence industry is concerned, the report points out that companies such as Expro and SNC-IT that are very dependent on federal ammunition contracts could be forced to close their doors, while the companies that now rely on support and service contracts could be compelled to move part of their operations.

I have here a whole list of excerpts from the report pointing to the main conclusion, namely, that separation would create very serious economic problems in Quebec and eliminate a great many jobs. I am willing to show the hon. member for Roberval, who requested it yesterday, the proof that the vast majority of