

Adjournment Debate

chase of the Orion P-3C "off the shelf". Gone was the necessity for a Canadian involvement in construction. Gone was the necessity for Canadian manufacture of the necessary electronic and surveillance systems. And gone also was \$11 million.

Last month I attended the North Atlantic Assembly meeting as leader of the Canadian delegation to the military committee of that august body. On the first morning of the meeting the rapporteur of the military committee, whose job it is to prepare a general report on the security of the alliance, came to see me about what I agreed was a matter of some urgency. It had been suggested to him that the following statement should be included in his general report on the security of the alliance as a new paragraph 9(a). It reads as follows:

The situation regarding Canadian military forces is far from satisfactory; the strength of their active forces has been reduced and no decisions have been made to replace major items of equipment for the land and air forces which have now become obsolete. A review of Canadian forces this year is likely to substantiate even more strongly the picture of Canada as a country determined to participate actively in, and influence the political councils of NATO, anxious to maintain her economic links with Europe, but unwilling to make a contribution to alliance defence which is commensurate either with these aspirations or her economic strength.

I was able to convince the rapporteur not to include that as it was too embarrassing for an all-party delegation to NATO, as it was the fault of only one party in this parliament—mainly a very selective group of the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence.

When we tracked back to see where the idea to include this paragraph originated we discovered it came from a person holding rank at the assistant secretary-general level in NATO, one can only assume this is the true opinion that NATO has of Canada as an ally.

I regret to say that both the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence frequently return from NATO and tell us that all is well, when such is not the case. When I receive an answer such as I did the other day to a legitimate question about the LRPA replacement, that is not good enough for this parliament, not good enough for the people of Canada and most particularly not good enough for the men and women of our armed forces who have been so misled, misinformed, and deceived by the Minister of National Defence and the Prime Minister.

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, from the language used by the hon. member it seems rather obvious that he is more interested in debate than an answer.

With regard to the question, it is pretty much a reiteration of the question he posed to the minister last week. As he himself has stated tonight, in response to his question on the procurement of new aircraft, specifically long range patrol aircraft, I can only repeat what the minister has said. The program is currently before cabinet in the form of the forces structure review, and when decisions on the matter have been taken, they will be announced.

● (2210)

The hon. member is also aware, although his words tonight did not indicate his awareness, that Canada has every intention of maintaining its level of contribution to

[Mr. McKinnon.]

the NATO alliance. The form in which this contribution will be made is also being considered as part of the defence structure review.

I, personally, spent a week at NATO headquarters last spring and certainly did not note the kind of atmosphere to which the hon. member referred this evening. I found the morale of the people there very high and all our allies, including the Secretary General of NATO, showed a high appreciation for the part Canada plays in NATO.

PENITENTIARIES—PROPOSED INSTITUTION AT MORNA, NEW BRUNSWICK—GOVERNMENT POSITION IN VIEW OF OBJECTIONS

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Madam Speaker, under date of May 23 the Solicitor General (Mr. Allmand) advised me by letter of plans to construct a new medium security institution in that part of the city of Saint John which is part of the constituency of Carleton-Charlotte.

Upon receipt of the letter on May 29 I phoned the minister's office and requested a map to show the exact location proposed for the institution. Despite repeated requests by telephone to the minister's office and in person to the minister, no map was supplied. On July 9 I wrote to the minister, repeating my request for the map. It was my intention to send a letter to all boxholders in the area concerned, to determine what their wishes might be in respect of the location of a penal institution in their neighbourhood. Without such information I would not be a reliable source of information for the minister. It would be meaningless to submit a questionnaire without knowing the exact location of the proposed site.

On July 28 I eventually mailed the questionnaires to the residents of the west Saint John area of the Carleton-Charlotte constituency. On the same day we learned that there might be another possible location for the institution and additional questionnaires were sent to the Lepreau-Maces Bay area of the constituency.

Under date of July 29 the map arrived at my office. Although the questionnaires had been mailed, the map was forwarded to the Saint John daily paper and published. This was helpful for those who answered the questionnaire.

In response to the 1,600 questionnaires, 450 people expressed their wishes. In the result, 94 per cent said they did not want the institution built in the area, 1 per cent were undecided, and 5 per cent favoured the west Saint John location. Such a number of replies and the resounding no makes it absolutely binding upon me to ask the minister to choose another location.

Since the first suggestion that a medium security institution should be built in the Saint John area, the public has protested bitterly. A petition against its location bore 1,400 names and was presented to the Common Council of the city of Saint John. This was supported by letters to the editor and an editorial in the *Saint John Telegraph Journal* of August 6, 1975. I quote the editorial in part, to reflect the feeling of the editor, as he, in turn, reflected the sentiments of the residents concerned. Referring to the map, the editor said: