

United Aircraft

company concerning these contracts, but that was denied me.

During the course of the strike, production was transferred from Canada to the parent company in the United States, thus depriving our workers of jobs which were paid for by the taxpayers of Canada. It seems to me that members of parliament have a legitimate obligation in a case like this. Even Liberals might be interested in finding out if public funds were being used to subsidize private corporations, and if the contracts concerned made it mandatory that the companies receiving those funds did all the work in Canada or if they were to be permitted to transfer employment to the United States or some other country.

Those parts of contracts that were provided after I asked for them in the House made some things clear. They made it clear that in providing millions of dollars to United Aircraft Corporation the government did not insist on written guarantees that work on these engines would be done in Canada. There was no provision to prevent United Aircraft Corporation shifting production from the province of Quebec to New England, which is what took place during the past year. The strike is still in progress and men have been out of work for 16 months. In my view, this is because the company did not fulfil its moral obligation to its employees, even if it did meet the letter of the law in terms of contracts signed by the federal government and United Aircraft Corporation.

During the course of this strike, the government signed additional contracts worth \$14 million. I should like to know, from whoever will speak for the government, if there are any contractual arrangements that made this mandatory. Not only has the government permitted this company to abuse its workers through previous contracts, but they have entered into new contracts fully aware of the reprehensible attitude of this corporation toward its employees.

I asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie) if the government should not require acceptance of the Rand formula as a minimum condition of good corporate citizenship. It could do that. Of course, enforcement of the Labour Code for most privately-owned industry lies within the jurisdiction of the provinces, but there is nothing to prohibit this government from setting minimum standards for its contracts with private corporations. I was anxious to see if this was discussed in correspondence between the company and the government. I suspect it was not. I suggest that kind of forceful declaration of principle outlining certain minimal standards should have been forthcoming from the federal government, and I want to see the correspondence to know exactly what is in it.

If the government is going to deny our right to see the correspondence, as I am sure it will, I want a spokesman for the government to tell us why. I want to know why in the future there should not be standards of good corporate citizenship, principles, and behaviour. I want to know why the government does not feel it appropriate that this company should be taken over as a Crown corporation and integrated with the other parts of the aircraft industry owned by the federal government, to establish a competi-

tive, progressive aircraft industry in Canada under public ownership.

● (1720)

I should like the government spokesman to suggest why that should not be done in this particular case, from the point of view of rationalizing the industry, especially as it is known that the very success of United Aircraft in Canada is dependent on funds provided by the taxpayers of Canada via the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

[Translation]

Mr. Fernand E. Leblanc (Laurier): Madam Speaker, motion No. 17 dated February 12, 1975 and moved by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) can be discussed today pursuant to Standing Order 48. I think it is important to talk about that rule which provides for the discussion of such problems.

The rule deals with the production of papers and allows a member who was not satisfied by the reasons given for refusing to produce the paper or papers requested to discuss the matter for one hour and forty minutes. The debate can be followed by a vote and according to the results of the division, the government either is forced to produce the papers requested by the hon. member and to do so as soon as possible, or is confirmed in the position it took about the problem raised by my hon. friend. Incidentally, I wish him good luck in his campaign for the leadership of his party.

To recall the chronology of events related to motion No. 17 proposed by the hon. member, one may refer to page 346 of *Hansard* for October 11, 1974, when he asked his first question about the United Aircraft Company to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie). The question read as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce concerning the United Aircraft Corporation in the Montreal area. Would the minister inform the House as to the discussions that have been reported to have taken place between his officials and that corporation concerning obtaining a guarantee from that company that it will place in Canada the amount of work to which it is committed by virtue of getting some \$70 million worth of assistance from the federal government? I refer to replacing in Canada work that has been transferred to the United States in recent months.

The hon. member said the same thing this evening. The reply was as follows, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I and my officials have met with senior officials of UACL and the United States parent corporation to determine and to clarify the longterm plans of the firm respecting both the repatriation of work that has been transferred from the Longueuil plant to East Hartford and the expansion plans of the Canadian company in Canada. I hope to have more to say on this point by next week.

Later on, early in 1975, the hon. member gave notice of motion for production of papers concerning the whole problem posed by United Aircraft. In the meantime, I was advised that United Aircraft had mentioned to the government, through the minister in charge, that during a strike it would give temporary sub-contracts for the construction of engines in the United States, essentially to continue deliveries and protect its position as major supplier on the international scene of gas turbines for small aircraft. The company assured the government of the temporary nature