

*Canadair Limited Divestiture Act*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** We are debating Bill C-25. The Hon. Member has spoken on the main motion but we are now on an amendment. The Hon. Member can participate in debate on the amendment. The Hon. Member for Vancouver—Kingsway (Mr. Waddell).

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway):** Madam Speaker, I wondered why the Hon. Member was giving us all that trouble. He was on another Bill. I hate to think what the Hon. Member was attempting to dismantle or privatize. I am being unfair to the Hon. Member. He may have been talking about Canagrex and wheat, I do not know. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) has a lot to contribute to this debate and is handy with the figures, although I am still not clear from which end of the Conservative dinosaur he is speaking, the mouth or the tail.

● (1250)

I would like to speak on the motion to hoist the Bill for six months. As critic for our Party, I have had a little pressure from requests that we get this Bill passed before Christmas. I hope we can get this matter addressed by some hon. members of the Conservative Party in the debate because, unless the Government changes its mind on this and other matters, it is not going to get the Bill passed by Christmas.

Hon. members of the New Democratic Party have a lot to say about this Bill. This is the first Bill which deals with privatization, an incredibly important topic that will heat up as a topic next year. It may be the topic for 1987. It is worth debating. I would also say to hon. members of the Liberal Party, come on, Liberals, get with it. Start participating in the House. You cannot just continually do your leadership things outside the House. Come and take part in the great issues facing Canada.

**An Hon. Member:** That is a commercial.

**Mr. Waddell:** No, it is not a commercial. If the Liberal Party is going to be a viable Party again it had better start participating in some of the issues and take a position. The Liberals are on both sides of the trade issue, the Cruise missile issue, NATO and all these other issues. They cannot just sit there like mugwumps, their mug on one side of the fence and their wump on the other and not take any position. At least the Conservative and the New Democratic Party take positions. In modern politics, the people want political Parties to take positions. The Liberal Party, to the extent it does not take any unified position, becomes an irrelevant Party. It is temporarily ahead in the Gallup polls but it will quickly disappear to third place. Look at what happened to the Liberal Party in Great Britain.

There is another reason the NDP wants to debate this Bill further, that is, we are concerned that there is not sufficient protection in the Bill for the ordinary working people in Quebec. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Keeper), gave a speech entirely in French without notes. He came to the House unilingual a few years ago. He

talked from a national standpoint of trying to protect jobs in Quebec. The jobs statement reads:

Bombardier is committed to maintaining existing levels of employment at Canadair subject—

All working people worry when they read lawyers' clauses which start with the word "subject".

—to cyclical shifts and sound business practices,—

If it has some money problems it can fire the workers. With respect to sound business practices, it can say, we have to be more productive. We need less workers. Then, bang, the workers are out on their ears. It decides it has to contract out and get away from the union. Then, bang, the workers are out.

This is the kind of thing from which Canadian workers are suffering all over the country. A good example was the International Woodworkers of America strike in British Columbia, my home province, which, thank goodness, has just been settled. The reason for the strike, with the loss of \$2 billion to the economy of British Columbia, was the fear that the contracting-out clause would in fact reduce union rights, and when union rights are reduced wages are dramatically lowered. Of course, that is what the employers want to do. That is why we are concerned about the phrase "sound business practices".

We have nothing against sound business practices and nothing against Canadair. We think Canadair is a very good Canadian Quebecois company. That is important. But we want to make sure the workers are protected. The workers also want to have sound business practices. They also want to be part of the enterprise. However, all too often the workers are left out of the compact, if you like, between employer and employee who are doing things for the good of each other and for both rather than for the good of one group, which is the trend in these Conservative times.

The statement continues that Bombardier:

—will pursue new programs and opportunities so that the level of employment at Canadair and its suppliers will increase.

We are in favour of that, but we worry about job security. We said in the debate, and I reiterate, that the reason we want the matter looked at in greater detail is that we think Canadair was fattened up prior to the final sale. At the very moment CDIC began the bidding process the Government approved \$30.9 million in defence assistance for the production of CL-227 systems and another \$20 million for Canadair's participation in a joint venture with West Germany on the CL-289. That is a total of \$50 million. Canadair will be eligible for more defence money; \$14 million to improve the CL-215 water bomber, \$10 million for modifications to the Challenger and \$5 million for new equipment, or approximately \$30 million in grants which have not yet been announced but which we think will come. This is apart from an unspecified amount of export financing to come.

Canadair was given the \$1.7 billion CF-18 jet fighter defence contract which is a guaranteed \$50 million per year for 20 years. The Canadian taxpayers will have to assume Canadair's