

*The Address—Mr. McKinnon*

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

#### TABLING OF AGREEMENT WITH FORD MOTOR COMPANY

**Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Madam Speaker, I wish to table under the appropriate standing order copies in both official languages of the agreement between the federal government and the Ford Motor Company dated October 23, 1978, relating to the Ford Essex engine plant. I also have copies for the opposition spokesmen.

\* \* \*

● (1220)

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed from Wednesday, April 16, consideration of the motion of Mrs. Côté for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto (Mr. Clark).

**Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Madam Speaker, may I congratulate you upon your elevation to the high post you hold. I am certain you will grace the position and we look forward to a long tenure under your charge.

When the bell started ringing last night I was speaking on the Speech from the Throne and I had mentioned the new fighter aircraft contract which was signed yesterday. I have not quite finished my remarks about it so I will finish them before I get into the main part of my speech.

I would caution the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Blais) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne), who provided the money to pay for this contract, to watch that contract very carefully. We are living in very fluid times, particularly with regard to finances. I am curious about many matters regarding that contract but unfortunately, as I mentioned last night, the minister did not see fit to table the contract and make a statement on motions at the same time. When a statement is made on motions in the House, it gives opposition spokesmen and members on all sides the opportunity to grill the minister and ask a long series of questions. There must be 30 or 40 questions that members of this House would like to put to the Minister of National Defence or the Minister of Supply and Services concerning that contract and the choice that was made. It takes weeks of questions to try and work through such a series of questions if we have to rely upon question period only. I hope this is not an indication that this government is going to return to their old style of not tabling documents and not making statements on motions procedures which help very much to clarify the business of the House and in fact to speed it up.

I would like to say a final word about the allocations to regions, which I mentioned last night. I would be very surprised if the NFA contract, when tabled, indicates that there is an allocation to regions of the work involved. I would be very surprised indeed. I cannot see how the government can dictate to the prime supplier that he must put so much work into any province or any region. This would give the supplier a wonderful opportunity to have cost overruns and then blame the government who directed that the work be put into certain regions. I expect that this will be done in the normal fashion by tender and by contract from the prime supplier to the subcontractors.

That is all I should like to say about the new fighter aircraft at the present time, partly because there are so many questions that the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne is hardly the place to try and get answers to such a multitude of questions.

I should like to refer for a moment to a remark made yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the House which startled me, to say the least. He was asked by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) if the government was considering a review by the Department of National Defence and the Department of External Affairs. The startling answer given by the Prime Minister is recorded in *Hansard* at page 67 as follows:

Such reviews were undertaken, as the hon. member will recall, in the late 1960s. They were subject to some criticism by the public and, indeed, by the opposition at that time, on the grounds that rather than acting, we were studying. It is our intention in this case to act, because our studies have already been completed.

If the Prime Minister really believes that a study made in the late 1960s is appropriate for action in the 1980s, I wonder where he has been for the last ten years. I suppose he has been in the Langevin Building, surrounded by his sycophants over there, and is totally divorced from what is going on in the world. The Department of External Affairs and the Department of National Defence cannot stay in limbo or maintain the status quo for 12 years!

I asked one of my staff members to let me know a few of the things that have happened since the Prime Minister had the last study on this matter, Mr. Speaker. I might point out also that just a year ago the Hon. Barney Danson said he could well see the need for a white paper on defence and that he intended to move forward with it as soon as possible. Of course, it is an embarrassment for the government to have a majority; they do not care whether they study things or not and will just go their own way.

To return to those ten or 12 missing years in the Prime Minister's life when he was divorced from reality, I would point out a few events that occurred in that time. In 1968 the Soviet Union suppressed Czechoslovakia's spring uprising and invaded that country with massive forces, deposing Mr. Dubcek's regime.

In 1970 the OPEC cartel for the first time forced foreign oil companies to concede increases in the posted price for oil. This was a change from the 50-50 policy that had held before that.