

and yet we still are going to have to pay out hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars to acquire a replacement helicopter.

The Bloc is talking about good paying jobs and high technology and they were there with the EH-101 contract. Ten per cent of the manufacturing of every helicopter produced worldwide would have been done in Canada. That would have meant a lot of jobs and a lot of money.

People will say that we are at peace. We are not at peace and I will come to that later. I remind members that some of the applications of this helicopter are peaceful as well as warlike. It had a naval version, a transport version and a passenger version and I think we are going to see more of this helicopter in the future.

I have heard estimates there is a market for 800 such helicopters. More recently I heard that the U.S. marine corps is thinking of buying 500. Think of the market that Canada has lost. Think of the jobs. Think of the high tech job creation we have lost by putting that behind us.

• (1135)

Let us talk generally about the defence industry. When anyone says defence industry it sparks emotion. It sparks emotion on the part of the general public which says it does not want a military industrial complex. I agree with the public that we do not want a military industrial complex that drives the government, such as we saw in the former United States model. We do not need that in Canada.

At the same time, however, we must be realistic and recognize that there is a defence industry. It will continue, we can be a contributor, and government should take its leadership role in asking industry what it can do best and how can government best encourage it without necessarily giving them dollops of money.

The idealism that gets involved, the exaggeration that is involved when one says defence industry, should really be moderated in Canada. It is too much of an extreme view when we hear people saying: "Oh, you can't even say the word defence industry because it is bad". The fact is there is a positive role for the defence industry, not just in employment but in creating new products for the good of all people. The government's role vis-à-vis the defence industry must be one of preserving a minimum base for that industry throughout the years ahead.

In this connection there is an organization called the Canadian Defence Preparedness Association, which I understand gave testimony to the joint committee in the last day or two. It has a real role to play with the government. Its objectives, if I may read it, are "to foster an industrial framework to achieve both the sustainment of forces in being and a modest mobilization capacity in times of conflict." I think that is a worthy objective.

### Supply

What government can do in conjunction with a group like the Defence Preparedness Association and other defence minded groups is to look ahead and ask how they may co-operate. Can we have the production of aircraft, for example, that are stressed so as to land on rough terrain but have an application, a use, in time of peace but are available to the government, to the Canadian forces in time of emergency?

The answer, if the government looks long term, is yes we can have things like that. Can we have, for example, roll on roll off ferries that are in day to day use, let us say with B.C. Ferry Corporation in British Columbia, subsidized to a degree by the Canadian government? If we can have these used in peacetime but also available in time of emergency, we have something that is a good combination for peace and war, if you will.

There are other things that the government can do in its leadership role vis-à-vis organizations such as the Defence Preparedness Association. One such is legislation. It should be listening to these organizations and asking how we can best support the militia or members of the militia by ensuring that they have a job once they come back from either peacekeeping operations or militia training. Things of that order can be done.

Implicit in the Bloc motion, or at least my interpretation of it, is that we are now in a time of peace. If that is so, I have to say we are not there yet. You simply have to look at Rwanda, the situation in Somalia and the situation in the former Yugoslavia. You can look anywhere in the world and if there is no trouble there right now, you can see it coming in the future.

• (1140)

In summary, there is good and bad to be said about this motion. I was cheered by the reply of the Minister of Industry. I think the government is going in the right direction. However, government can do much more in the planning sphere to create jobs and to make better life for us all.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on what the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan said about the F-18.

I think it would be a good idea to remind the hon. member for Nanaimo—Cowichan of the historical facts on the F-18. We need to place the F-18 events in their historical context. In this regard, we must remember that during the referendum debate, after our friends opposite got involved, in particular the hon. member for Saint-Maurice, who was already a minister in Mr. Trudeau's Cabinet, Quebecers were promised a carrot: "If you vote against the Parti Québécois' proposal to give them the mandate to negotiate eventual sovereignty with all related commitments, we promise you, first of all, that the superspecialized F-18 will be built in Quebec". That was the carrot.