

My second question is: Is the minister still convinced the estimate of \$1.5 billion of economic benefits for Quebec is realistic?

Mr. Chairman, my third question is this: Is it true that during the negotiations the PQ government minister, Mr. Duhaime not to name him, was given an opportunity to come and see the F-16 and F-18 file, and that he did not avail himself of that opportunity?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, it is my view that our analysis of the economic spinoffs for the province of Quebec of the F-18 contract is very realistic. In our view, at least 48 per cent of these spinoffs will be located in the province of Quebec.

As we are all aware, the province of Quebec holds a very important place in this government's mind as far as the avionics industry is concerned. We intend to make the Quebec component of that industry a leading sector, while strengthening the industry throughout the country.

The hon. member also asked for details on the possible sites for the turbine blade and vane plant and the digital control machining centre. I can confirm to my hon. colleague that, quite evidently, the turbine blade and vane facility will be built in the eastern townships, although the exact site has not been determined yet. I regret to give the same answer as far as the site for the machining centre is concerned.

In his third question, my hon. colleague asked whether the PQ minister was given an opportunity to consult all the data on which was based our decision to award McDonnell Douglas the F-18 contract. According to my information, those ministers were offered a briefing just before the announcement. But later they were also given an opportunity to have exchanges and discussions between our officers and those of the Quebec government.

I would like to conclude my answer by confirming that in our view, and according to our rather involved analysis, the F-18 contract is a good opportunity for the industry in the province of Quebec and Canada as a whole.

[*English*]

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to ask a few questions this evening. Before doing so, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I think this is the first time in my 23 years in the House of Commons that I have seen such a distinguished panel of ministers. All four are such a temptation—

An hon. Member: Like a shooting gallery.

Mr. Crouse: An hon. member says like a shooting gallery. I am not quite sure I know where to begin. To put it in the language of the people I represent, I think perhaps in light of what I heard today someone, perhaps it falls on me, should attempt to get this government back on course. It is obvious it is off course. It has lost its sense of direction and is out there

Supply

wandering around in a fog of uncertainty not knowing where it is going.

I say that because during the recent election campaign we saw some pretty heavy brass. We had more Liberal brass in Nova Scotia—some could have come to see me, but they did not, they went to see others—than we have flotsam and jetsam along the coast. There was a lot of talk about energy, a lot of talk about oil, and we even had a lot of gas down that way. Before I place my question—

An hon. Member: Ask your question.

Mr. Crouse: I have 20 minutes sir. You had the same amount of time. I think I can use it any way I choose. I hope I am correct. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources indicates that I am correct. I read from the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* of Saturday, February 2:

In the most major speech of the campaign to date, in Halifax last Friday, the Liberals through their leader Pierre Trudeau presented the Liberal's energy program for the 80s. A program designed to achieve energy security at a fair price for all Canadians. The Liberal program featured the following seven major commitments.

I will not read them all because the Liberals are well aware of them, even though they are not introducing them. One reads:

Liberals realize Canada needs to substitute plentiful resources such as natural gas for the energy resources we are short of like oil. Therefore under "Made in Canada" policies, natural gas will not be pegged to rising international prices. It will be set at a lower made-in-Canada level to encourage people to switch. Massive exports as those endorsed by Joe Clark would be thoroughly investigated so Canadians would always have first claim to their own natural gas resource.

There would be a natural gas pipeline to ensure all Canadians access to their resources.

Liberals would take immediate action—

I hope the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources listens carefully to this.

—to begin negotiations for construction of a natural gas pipeline to Quebec City and the maritimes. Initially it would carry natural gas east but when maritime supplies are ready, the pipeline would be like a natural gas railroad with a return delivery facility as well.

On the same date the Prime Minister appeared in Halifax. I read just a short excerpt from his speech:

But in order to switch, people must have access to gas. Nowhere is access needed more than in eastern Canada. I am announcing today, as part of our program, that a Liberal government will take immediate action to ensure the full co-operation of all parties in the construction of a natural gas pipeline to Quebec City and the maritimes. The pipeline will have reversible capacity—

I presume this was made with the full knowledge of the National Energy Board.

—so that maritimers will have the opportunity, both to use western natural gas now and to send offshore gas to central Canada later. Like the railroad in the 1880s, energy pipelines in the 1980s have the potential to be a steel link uniting the nation.

That is a very fine promise, a very fine pledge. For a starter, I would like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources how does he reconcile his speech today with the undertaking, firm pledge and promise made by the Prime Minister in Halifax.