

*Oral Questions*

In light of those facts, would the minister explain to the House the immediate measures he would take to increase the shipbuilding capacity in Canada?

**Hon. J. Robert Howie (Minister of State (Transport)):** Mr. Speaker, the role of shipbuilding is the responsibility of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and the role of transport is the development of a policy for a deep sea fleet for Canada. These are two somewhat related roles and are part of our attempt to move Canada forward again. I suggest, however, that the questions could best be put to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

**An hon. Member:** He is not here.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**INDUSTRY**

## STATUS OF CANADAIR AFTER SALE

**Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for International Trade and concerns the development of the aeronautical industry in Canada. I recently directed a question to the Prime Minister about the sale of Canadair to the private sector and the Prime Minister indicated that it would eventually be sold to a Canadian corporation. My question is this: Could the minister inform the House whether this private corporation would be Canadian-controlled, as defined by the Income Tax Act, or whether it would be a corporation made up of Canadian residents creating a Canadian association precisely in order to buy Canadair?

● (1500)

[English]

**Hon. Ron Huntington (Minister of State for Small Businesses and Industry):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of the privatization of Canadair is under consideration by cabinet.

**Mr. Chrétien:** For the last five years!

**Mr. Huntington:** If you do not mind, I will just try to answer the question. It has been under consideration by cabinet and all aspects of it are being considered. It will not be sold other than to the benefit of Canada and Canadians: that can be assured. Whether it is in a condition at the moment to be privatized is still under consideration. It is in the process of developing substantial forward movement in certain aeronautical markets; we are all well aware of that. In the privatization process there will be no downside to it, as far as this government is concerned.

[Mr. Murphy.]

[Translation]

INQUIRY WHETHER PROVINCES COULD PURCHASE DE HAVILLAND AND/OR CANADAIR

**Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the minister tell the House whether a provincial government could be considered as a potential buyer of Canadair, and also whether the same treatment is kept in store for de Havilland?

[English]

**Hon. Ron Huntington (Minister of State for Small Businesses and Industry):** Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. There is not much point in privatizing something if it is then turned over to another level of government.

\* \* \*

**TRANSPORT**

## CARRIAGE OF DANGEROUS GOODS

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) may have advertently or inadvertently left the impression with the House that I and my party were not supportive of the principle surrounding the transportation of dangerous goods. In the process of a question he quoted passages from a speech that I delivered in the House on February 16, 1979, as recorded in *Hansard* at pages 3330 and 3331.

In quoting those passages, he dealt with a section of my speech which concerned what I considered to be a deficiency in the transportation policy of the former government as well as deficiencies in the legislation.

Perhaps I might be allowed to put the position of my party, myself and the government—

**Mr. Speaker:** The minister, I am sure, will realize that he is entering into a disagreement with the questioner.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, there was an interpretation that did not accurately reflect my position—

**Mr. Speaker:** In one line, that is my description of a disagreement.

I am sure the minister will want to check words I addressed to the House only two days ago in which I indicated that at the conclusion of question period there has been a temptation on the part of members to raise matters of privilege of which notices have been sent to the Chair on the basis of disagreements that arise during question period. There has been a tendency on my part to take a rather generous attitude in allowing this kind of procedural intervention at the end of the question period, during which a member on either side of the House seeks to correct a disagreement or an inaccurate