

Oral Questions

[Translation]

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

IRREGULARITIES COMMITTED BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, while the Government is making cuts in the Employment Development Program, while the Minister and this Government are cutting unemployment insurance benefits for older workers, and while the Government is refusing to make the early retirement program available to older workers, the Auditor General informs us that a Hongkong bank was able to avoid paying \$200 million in income tax; that the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Mazankowski) was able to get his friends \$5 million for an amusement park; that at National Defence, \$35 million was improperly spent, some equipment was not necessary, and \$8,613 worth of equipment was bought which could have been bought for \$912.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that a Conservative Government that now wants to cut funds that are directly earmarked for Canadians, should waste taxpayers money to do its friends a favour.

* * *

[English]

AIRPORTSOTTAWA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—MAPLE LEAF LOUNGE—
ABSENCE OF CANADIAN WINES

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, Ottawa is the capital of Canada and is, or should be, the epitome, the essence of all things Canadian. It has a spanking new airport with the commodious Maple Leaf Lounge.

I have the wine list of that lounge in my hand and it reads: "Imported red and white wine", in both official languages, without a mention of Canadian brands being available. In fact, no Canadian brands are available. Upon special request a search was made and the response given: "We do not stock Canadian wines".

Just think what a positive force the Maple Leaf lounges across the country could be if each one of them carried a short list of Canadian wines and if imports were made available upon request only. Is this not what a Canadian would expect if travelling abroad? Why do we at home have to be so different, downgrading and indifferent?

If this approach continues to exist I urge all Members of the House to pick up a bottle of Canadian wine—they are becoming collectors' items.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

AUTO PACT—POSITION OF NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative MPs here in the House and outside in western Canada have been waging a despicable and offensive campaign against the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Broadbent) on the Auto Pact. They have been saying that the Auto Pact is an example of free trade—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Waddell: —which Bob White, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), and others are denying to western Canada.

It is simply false to suggest that the Prime Minister's (Mr. Mulroney) trade deal is equivalent to the Auto Pact. The Auto Pact requires that the United States automakers maintain a certain level of investment in Canada, basically proportionate to their sales in Canada. If these U.S.-controlled automakers do not want to make such a commitment, they must pay tariffs to get their cars into Canada. Had the Government negotiated a free trade deal *à la* the Prime Minister in 1965, today many of the jobs and plants in the Canadian automotive sector would be found in Georgia or in Alabama.

My Leader and the NDP do not want western Canada to be just a resource hinterland. We want regional development and a diversified economy. In the past few days the Conservatives have been preaching a form of regional racism which is despicable, petty and false.

I dare them to call an election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TRADECANADA-UNITED STATES TRADE AGREEMENT—COMMITTEE
HEARINGS—STUDY OF FINAL TEXT

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree after that in saying to the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent): "Ed, let him back in".

● (1420)

Yesterday the Prime Minister defended the nonsensical proposition that it is right for the parliamentary committee to have only four days to study the final text of the trade deal with the United States.

In this session the parliamentary committee studying the Radio Act amendments took two months, and, Sir, that Bill was only three lines long. The parliamentary committee studying the National Archives Act amendment took two