

**Mr. Speaker:** When shall the bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House, pursuant to order made earlier this day?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Ms. Langan:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Saskatoon—Dundurn thinks he was missed in the count for the last round and would like to have his vote included with the NDP caucus in the applied votes.

• (1755)

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Shields:** Mr. Speaker, I just want everyone in the House to realize that in Calgary today it is 20 degrees Celsius.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

**Mr. Boudria:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Given that it is 5.55 p.m., our colleague who has the private member's motion that we will be discussing now will only be entitled to have his motion discussed for five minutes. I would like to ask the consent of the House to call it six o'clock and permit this Private Members' Hour to be an hour, which after all was the intent behind the rules.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the suggestion by the hon. member. Is there agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 is deemed to have been moved.

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on a follow-up to a question I asked the Minister of National Defence some time ago. The question was essentially on the report of the Auditor General who looked at the difficulty he saw in the defence program management system.

### Adjournment Debate

This was a very serious allegation because we are looking at expenditures of really fantastic and mind-boggling proportions and major programs in the hundreds of millions of dollars. It is not every program that is \$6 billion or \$10 billion. It is only the major capital projects, but it is not very difficult for a project to assume the dimension of \$100 million.

The point I want to make at the outset, which I believe was missed by the minister, was that I did not make these allegations. They were made by no less an authority than the Auditor General. I know some of my previous colleagues in the Department of National Defence are uncomfortable about this observation.

I simply asked the present minister and her predecessor to make a comment on this, discuss it in defence committee or make a ministerial statement to say it was not accurate and the defence department was looking at it, or it was accurate and corrections were being made. I happen to think it is not totally accurate, but the point is, the observation has been made.

We are looking at tremendous expenditures in the controversial EH-101 program. Notwithstanding its merits, this expenditure in the magnitude of \$5.8 billion is being managed by a program which the Auditor General calls into question. This controversial program is under discussion practically every day in the media and in this House. The more specific observation was made that the defence program management system does not totally address the system. Using the words of the Auditor General, it is also ineffective. He went on to say that all the problems that were observed occurred in the initial stages of these major programs. If that observation is overlaid on the situation as it exists with the EH-101 program, the result is a recipe for considerable concern and consternation with respect to those people who are following the progress of these important programs.

• (1800)

I would simply like the minister to address this observed deficiency. I would invite her to make a statement in the House of Commons. It is very simple and would take less than a couple of minutes. Alternatively, she could make use of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs and appear in front of the committee to address this very disturbing and very significant observation that was made by the Auditor General who has the authority and credibility to do so.