

Oral Questions

Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I do not feel I am drawing conclusions. The complaints are there for anybody to read.

Also the Auditor General has said on page 584 of his report that one of the reasons the superintendent is having problems is that this government has taken so long to bring in modern trust and loan company legislation.

Will the minister not admit that his government's inaction has reduced the effectiveness of the superintendent's office? Will he also tell the House what he is going to do about the Auditor General's recommendations that are not covered by Bill C-83?

Hon. Gilles Loiseau (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)): It is of course essential, Mr. Speaker, that the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions runs a very important shop for our financial institutions.

They have been involved daily on all reform. They have been with us and have been the best advisers we have ever had. We have made major changes. They have all the means that they need to have because they recuperate their funding from the institutions themselves. In no way have we hindered them. On the contrary, we are prepared to work with them to be sure that this country has the best system of supervision it is possible to have.

* * *

HAVILLAND

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology or, rather, his surrogate.

Today, the CAW is taking the government to court to ensure enforcement of contract provisions agreed to between the government and Boeing Corporation which were intended to ensure that airplane production, research and development, and jobs would remain at de Havilland in Canada.

My question to the minister is quite simple. Why should Canadian workers be forced to take their own government to court to ensure that when de Havilland is acquired by two foreign governments the jobs of Canadians will not be threatened?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, the House knows, and I hope the hon. member knows, that when this particular company was sold it was sold to Boeing Corporation, which is one of the best marketing companies in the world. Since then, the order book for that particular company has grown and grown through de Havilland.

However, they have decided that given the kind of market they want to be in they would like to make the sale. They are going to look at potential buyers. They have brought this company to a state of health which is much better than it ever was before it was originally sold to Boeing. When the offer to purchase comes, of course Investment Canada will look at it to see that it is a net benefit to Canada.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Mr. Speaker, the minister's surrogate evidently agrees with the minister who, in a meeting with the CAW, is quoted as having said that Boeing owns the plant and can do whatever it wants to do.

Is that how the minister sees his job, to very nearly give away de Havilland, hand over about \$200 million of taxpayers money to Boeing Construction, and then for the government to sit on its collective butt while Canadian jobs are given away?

Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member calls creating over 1,500 jobs at de Havilland in the last three years sitting on its butt, I do not know what he is talking about.

The hon. member knows—and he talks a bit like a surrogate for the CAW when he asks his question that this particular matter is before the courts. He also knows that in his question there were three hypotheticals. We do not even have a sale yet and we have this particular matter before the court.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Supply and Services. The Auditor General's report was quite clear and explicit concerning the use of computers, especially dealing with the threats and risks of illegal computer penetration and infestation, as well as safeguarding the data which are so vital for the delivery of government services. Can the Minister tell us why, after five years of warning, this situation still exists?