

Motions for Papers

DISCONTINUANCE OF PRODUCTION BY KAISER JEEP CANADA LTD.

Motion No. 199—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Kaiser Jeep Canada Ltd. regarding the discontinuation of its production activities in Canada.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wishes to inform the hon. member that the correspondence requested includes confidential information on the internal affairs of the parent corporation and the Canadian company's performance under the automotive agreement. Such information is proprietary and its disclosure could have a serious effect not only with this particular parent corporation and its future Canadian operations but with other companies, as well, which have provided similar information in confidence. In view of this, the minister would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Broadbent: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE GRANTS

Motion No. 256—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a list of the 278 development incentive grants made by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion from January to mid-November 1969, and in each case (a) the name and address of the firm receiving the grant (b) the amount of grant received (c) the total estimated capital cost of the project (d) the nature of the project for which the grant was provided and its location (e) the number of new jobs created as a result of the project?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the cases referred to are not grants paid out but offers made. The details requested will be made public in all cases when the project is proceeded with, and before any grant is actually paid. But at the offer stage, confidentiality is essential to the program.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary has consulted with me on this matter. The information provided leads me to the conclusion that the department's press release of November 19 announcing the number of new jobs created in 1969 is a hoax and a fraud. Therefore I ask that this motion be put to a vote.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire when I may expect notice of motion No. 80 standing in my name, which has been on the Order Paper since October 23, to be called?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will inquire, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, can the House Leader also say when notice of motion No. 32 under my name as of October 23 will be called?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I shall make that inquiry as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my inquiry of the President of the Privy Council relates to a notice of motion for the production of papers which has been passed. I refer to No. 30 passed on December 17, 1969, having to do with the report of Professor Jeremy Williams on the subject of conflict of interest legislation. Can the minister say when this document, already ordered, will be tabled?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Today or tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire about Notices of Motion Nos. 295 and 296 placed on the order paper on December 9. It seems to me it should have been possible to deal with these motions before now.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION FROM ALLIES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence what the policy of the government is in light of the fact that our allies have reduced substantially Canada's accessibility to military and strategic information, a situation which could be very serious for the future of our defence activities?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition is drawing conclusions that are not warranted by the testimony to which he is obviously referring.