

*Oral Questions*

economy? Is that what the Canadian Government, the Conservative Government, wants to do to the Canadian economy?

**Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I think all Parties in this House agreed at the time of the White Paper that we had to do something to refurbish the Canadian Armed Forces. We decided we had to buy some new equipment. Instead of buying equipment overseas and off the shelf, we are trying to make it in Canada. We are trying to spread it around within the regions of Canada to have the best industrial benefits for the various regions. That is Canadian, that is sovereignty, and that is common sense. He should try it sometime.

\* \* \*

**DISASTERS****1985 GANDER AIR CRASH—REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF JUDICIAL INQUIRY**

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister and concerns the Gander air crash of December 12, 1985, which resulted in the unfortunate deaths of 256 people. Four members of the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, a former member of the board, several respected members of the aviation community, and Mrs. Theresa Griffin, the widow of the pilot who perished in the Gander tragedy, called earlier today for a judicial inquiry into all the circumstances surrounding the crash.

Given that the Deputy Prime Minister himself repeatedly called for such an inquiry into the 1978 crash at Cranbrook, British Columbia, which resulted in 43 deaths, and given that he himself later commissioned the Dubin inquiry, can he give his commitment here and now that he will ask for a judicial commission of inquiry into the Gander air crash?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the Act requires that a draft report be issued and that is exactly what we did with respect to the Gander crash in 1985. The Act also proposed that we could receive any representation by any concerned party in terms of the conclusions of the draft report. I think it would be more than irrelevant that the Minister or any government party could call any kind of inquiry without waiting for the final report.

My friend will admit that we could not reach a conclusion on a preliminary report. I think the Act is structured that way and I hope that my friend will respect an Act which was introduced by his Government.

**GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, that response is totally inadequate. The Minister knows perfectly well there has been conflicting evidence, that

there has been testimony which has been ignored, and that there has been information kept from the Canadian Aviation Safety Board. He will know that he himself sent a letter to the new chairman asking members of the board to obey the new chairman. Given that kind of interference already by this Government, is it not reasonable to expect that justice be done? Isn't the only way to do that to call for a Royal Commission of Inquiry into this accident? Otherwise justice will never be done and Canadians, Americans, and everyone else will never know the truth concerning this crash.

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, it is always the same. Any kind of regular proceeding is decided by an Act, not by me, but by an Act of this House. This Act has decided we have to provide a preliminary report, and as I said before, we did, and any concerned party, including those who appeared yesterday, have the right to make a proposal, or to criticize, and then we will have a final report. At that time the Minister will consider the recommendations.

Once again, this Act was passed by your Party and I have to work within the rules. This was decided by you and I hope that you understand that, and will respect the Act that decided that I have to play the game by those rules.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE****PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES**

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister who will know that with each passing day more and more Canadians are speaking out against the Government's decision to spend billions of dollars of taxpayers' money on nuclear-powered hunter-killer submarines.

**Mr. Siddon:** Look at the Gallup polls, Nelson.

**Mr. Riis:** One defence analyst recently stated that "if the subs are really meant to scare anyone, the threat is surely half hearted. What would one of our new subs do if it came across a Russian or American sub in our waters? Sink it? Hardly . . . I believe that a fleet of icebreakers, along with super sophisticated underwater monitoring systems would do a better job of protecting our Canadian shores". Would the Deputy Prime Minister agree that this defence analyst is correct and that these submarines are in fact not only wasteful but a dangerous way to spend taxpayers' money?

**Hon. Paul Dick (Associate Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, an analysis has been done and the proposal to use nuclear-powered submarines is \$1.9 billion less than the proposal of the New Democratic Party. It gives a more effective coverage in the Atlantic, in the Pacific, and in the Arctic. If the Member felt he was going to protect the lives of