

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Roy MacLaren (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, there is no intention at the moment to begin a public inquiry of the type the hon. member has raised but, rather, to pursue an internal review as the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources announced a few days ago.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Madam Speaker, that announcement will come as a very great disappointment to literally hundreds of thousands of Canadians who feel they should have an opportunity to present their views on this very serious and important question.

My question to the parliamentary secretary, in view of the fact that he is answering on behalf of the minister, is: Will he be able to table as soon as possible the terms of reference with respect to an internal inquiry, and will the minister be in a position to let us know precisely the nature of that inquiry? Will the inquiry be open, and will the people of Canada have an opportunity to participate, whatever form it may take?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I was involved in the discussions of this matter with the parliamentary secretary and the minister. On behalf of the government, I would like to explain why we are not at this time organizing a public inquiry: it is because the time schedule for keeping our industry viable is very, very short.

We are now in danger of seeing the Canadian industry become obsolete and lose its chance to sell in other countries of the world unless we make some quick decisions on some basic questions. It is in order to get these quick decisions that we in the government want to establish our own policy in a firm way.

There is no intention of preventing the Canadian public, concurrently or subsequently, from participating in various ways and expressing their views, but we cannot wait for a long inquiry to decide whether we stay in the game or get out of the game. That is the essence of the situation.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** That is not the question. Shameful.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE****DEFENCE PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS—ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION IN AWARDING**

**Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River):** Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of National Defence. It is based on the remarks which he made in the House last Friday.

Could the minister explain why he is discriminating against industry in western Canada and in Atlantic Canada in defence procurement contracts? Could he also explain why work on the F-18 which was earmarked for British Columbia was moved from that area to central Canada, and why he committed in this House last Friday the work associated with the frigate program to Quebec without offering a fair share to the people of British Columbia and Atlantic Canada? Also, why has the minister not made available full details and fair opportunities

on the new truck acquisition, choosing to make vague promises to the province of Quebec, rather than outlining how such a contract of defence procurement could help the government's national industrial strategy?

[Translation]

**Hon. J. Gilles Lamontagne (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I think the question put by the hon. member of the New Democratic Party is rather lengthy and would take some time to answer, but I can say this, in general: when we are discussing various contracts and supplies for the Department of National Defence, we take into consideration the basic principle of the Canadian confederation, namely, the equitable distribution of the economic impact throughout Canada—that means all provinces, including Quebec, British Columbia and Ontario. That is the principle we apply when giving out the various contracts we must award.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PRIVILEGE****MR. ROBERTS—REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF LANGUAGE USED BY HON. MEMBER FOR VANCOUVER SOUTH—RULING BY MADAM SPEAKER**

**Madam Speaker:** Yesterday, the hon. Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts) questioned the language used by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser). I indicated that I would check *Hansard*. I had said that I had not heard the hon. member for Vancouver South say anything which seemed to me to be unparliamentary. I have checked *Hansard* and found that the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver South was as follows:

They have completely circumvented the right of the hon. member for Peterborough to raise that matter in this House on behalf of his constituents and receive an honest answer from a government which, in this case, is not only acting dishonestly, but shabbily.

The words which presented the difficulty are not directed to individual members of the House but, rather, to the government. I must rule as my predecessors, that such words directed to the government collectively are not unparliamentary.

**MR. WADDELL—COMPOSITION OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION**

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. On May 23, which will be coming up shortly, the Canadian-United States interparliamentary group will be going to San Diego for a conference. With respect to this conference, there are only two members of the New Democratic Party who are able to go.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Waddell:** They are the environment critic and the finance critic. The seminars which are being held at the