

Supply

and cover up what is taking place. One might think that somewhere among all this writhing of arms and spewing of ink, the ink coming from his interviews with the press, there is an agenda, a direction, because that is what the Minister tries to suggest in the interviews he gives.

● (1210)

Frankly, he has got a remarkably good press. The press has suggested that somewhere below all of this *ad hoc* activity there is a strategy. I have looked at the latest effort to set out that strategy in *The Financial Post* article which has been referred to in this debate, and I must tell you that there are some very interesting ideas in that article. Many of them, things such as industrial agreements, long-term government-company arrangements, are things we as a Party wrote about in 1978 in talking about an industrial strategy for this country. So it is most gratifying to see the Minister finally, eight years later, starting to speak in those terms. But I do not believe that that is the reality. As I look at the record, I do not believe that it shows the sense of direction the Minister claims is there.

It is now about eight months since this Government was elected. The Minister has the longest memory of those in this House and he delights in getting up and attacking the previous regime. But that starts to ring hollow after a while. While the Government might have had excuses after two months, four months or, stretching it, even after six months, after eight months you cannot continue to blame the previous Government for the lack of an industrial policy direction in this country. That Minister has to carry the responsibility. He has had the time to do more than give interviews to *The Financial Post*. He has had the time to set out a direction and follow that direction in the activities of his Ministry, but, frankly, he has not done so.

I want to take you, Mr. Speaker, through some of those key cases which demonstrate just how inadequately, how short-sightedly, how foolishly that Minister has performed in the eight months he has been in office. Let me illustrate first that industry which is very important not just to my constituency but to the whole manufacturing industry in this country, that is, the automobile industry. In *The Financial Post* the Minister talks about encouraging industry-government agreements, setting out a plan for that industry. But he has had a task force report on that industry sitting on his desk from day one. It shows him a direction which has been agreed on, not just by the companies in that industry but by the trade unions as well, a direction which would put into effect Canadian content requirements in order to produce jobs here. Yet there has been absolutely no action on that report. Indeed, it has been worse than that. With respect to the renewal of quota arrangements with Japan, the Minister has led us in a song and dance. He promised that he would have some kind of firm signal on Japanese auto quotas by mid-May, yet there is nothing. So the industry limps along with a sense of uncertainty about the future. Yet the Minister has the temerity, the self-righteousness, to speak to *The Financial Post* about his commitment to industry-government agreements. He has refused to respond positively to the danger signs which exist in that industry.

These danger signs have been evidenced in the decision by Chrysler Corporation to put major parts production in South Korea. I have pressed the Minister to raise with Chrysler Corporation the fact that if it has the financial resources to do that, it should also have the financial resources to reopen the engine plant in Windsor. It committed itself to doing so when it asked for \$200 million worth of loan guarantees from the Canadian Government. It got that commitment, which in turn got it the \$1.5 billion in loan guarantees from the U.S. Government, yet the Minister will not press Chrysler to get those extra jobs. It seems to me that this Minister is not living up to the challenges which face him.

Another challenge, and frankly one that I expected this Minister and this Government to take most seriously, is that of showing the Canadian people that the money we spend to help the private sector companies is in fact leading to jobs. On March 20 I wrote to the Minister about a classic case involving \$275 million given to Bell Helicopter by the previous Government supposedly to result in over 3,000 jobs in Quebec. I suggested in the letter that serious questions had come up with reference to that particular project, and I can tell Hon. Members that I am now in possession of material which makes the importance of those questions even clearer. We have received copies of a secret Science Council report which studied that project. The Science Council in preparing its report had access to the Cabinet memorandum that went to the previous Liberal Cabinet describing this project. Within that Cabinet memorandum there was a commitment that the Bell Helicopter proposal would create the largest number of jobs, an average of about 2,773 over the life of the project. That Cabinet document indicates that Bell Helicopter agreed to place work of equivalent quality and value in Canada in the event that its job targets were not met. That Cabinet memorandum said as well that Bell Helicopter is seeking 67 per cent of the total cost of \$409 million for this project.

● (1220)

Each of those statements made in that Cabinet memorandum has clearly emerged as being false. One can only draw the conclusion that that Cabinet memorandum conveyed information to the Government which, intentionally or unintentionally, was grossly inaccurate. The Government was misled with respect to the number of jobs to be generated by this project. It has become clear that only 600 jobs are to be generated by the project.

Second, Bell Helicopter has not been prepared to put extra production of other kinds into this country, despite its failure to produce the original number of jobs suggested, and despite the fact that it made a commitment, according to that Cabinet document. Finally, it has become clear that there was an attempt, after this Cabinet memorandum was presented, to obscure and change the proportion of the financial contribution from this private company to Bell Helicopter.

In this case all sorts of misinformation was put before Cabinet and a decision was made on that basis. It seems to me that the Minister has a responsibility in such a case to have a