

those are advantages, what about the disadvantages? Crown corporations must pursue money-losing national interest objectives, sometimes carry heavy debt loads, and deal with a complex and bureaucratized shareholder, namely, the Government of Canada or the provincial Government. In this instance, the argument is balanced and it is difficult to tell which is better.

It is suggested that privatization will lead to enhanced competition. How will this happen? In the case of de Havilland and Canadair, there is no real competition. Some of the candidates for privatization will be sold to monopolies.

It is suggested that public corporations do not make as efficient use of the factors of production as private firms. I could stand here and say that Dome Petroleum, Massey-Ferguson, and Maislin Trucking are examples of bad private sector corporations, just as there are bad corporations in the public sector. It depends upon which corporations one focuses to see winners and losers.

Another argument in support of privatization is that it will have a positive impact on Government. First, privatization can be used to get rid of the public corporations whose mandates are irrelevant to wider policy objectives. In this case, instead of arguing that Crown corporations are inefficient, the line is that they are ineffective. However, how do we decide if the mandates of public corporations are irrelevant if we cannot find a clear mandate statement for them? Perhaps they should be given a clear mandate and be made publicly accountable. Perhaps they should be reformed rather than eliminated, *per se*.

Professor Langford says that the most pronounced hostility to public corporations and the most pronounced support for privatization comes from people in managerial and supervisory positions making more than \$50,000 per annum.

This is essentially the first debate on privatization that we have held in the House. The Minister gave a very disappointing speech today because she did not deal with some of those issues.

Mr. Mantha: Yours is beautiful.

An Hon. Member: She is a rising star.

Mr. Waddell: There is a difference between giving a public relations speech by reading the notes from bureaucrats, and actually showing some understanding of the issue. This issue needs to be debated in Canada. We should not try to focus on the neo-Conservative ideology behind this issue, but on the economic realities. This applies to my Party as well as the Liberal Party. We cannot oppose the sale of all Crown corporations, but we can, as responsible politicians and political parties, say that we want to know why the Government supports privatization. Is it to protect jobs in Montreal, in this case? If so, job protection is weak. Is it to gain money for the Government? As I have pointed out, this is practically a distressed sale. Is it a matter of economic planning or future development in the aerospace industry? Previously, the

Canadair Limited Divestiture Act

Conservatives wanted a super Crown corporation by combining de Havilland and Canadair. Now they have sold de Havilland to an American corporation. Where is the planning?

While it may be more beneficial to sell to a Canadian corporation in this case, than to an American corporation, where is the expertise in Bombardier? It is a good corporation, but where is the expertise in international marketing of aircraft and aerospace parts? The Government gave that expertise for the rationalization of the sale of de Havilland to Boeing. The Government's policy is riddled with inconsistencies.

We are opposing the Bill for three reasons. First, the Bill is based on ideological and non-economic grounds. Second, there are no clear goals for privatization of this Crown corporation, indeed for any other privatizations proposed by the Government. Third, the nature of the deal itself is a distressed sale of a fattened Crown corporation, practically given away to the private sector with inadequate job guarantees for the workers. That is why we oppose this Bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Ricard (Laval): Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me today to deal in this House with the privatization of the Canadair Corporation and its sale to the Quebec-based Bombardier Corporation. I am pleased also to see that the Liberal Party is supporting this sale as well as this Government bill. I am not surprised to see that the New Democratic Party is against it, for its position is well known: it is always against any legislation which is not biased in favour of the unions. No wonder, therefore, that it is against this particular bill.

Madam Speaker, any Quebecer worthy of the name—I know several—can only rejoice when he realizes that the only Quebec airplane manufacturer will remain in Quebec, that it will employ a skilled workforce from Quebec, that it will keep its technology in Quebec while selling its production on the international market.

Let anyone propose a better arrangement than this and I am willing to analyze it. Although those who oppose the economic development of Quebec may say that the Government made a political decision when it selected Bombardier as buyer for Canadair, the fact remains that Quebec is and will always be interested in its technological development, and the private sector, together with its government partners, will do everything it can to achieve this aim.

Madam Speaker, we should not forget that Montreal and its metropolitan area has always been recognized as Canada's aeronautic and aerospace hub. That does not mean that there are no similar activities elsewhere in Canada. Quite the contrary: Canada is well-known the world over as being at the forefront of the aeronautic development. However, one should remember that over 50 per cent of all the jobs in the aeronautic industry are in Quebec, and more specifically in the Montreal region.

Why Montreal, Madam Speaker? Because the Montreal region has the airports and infrastructure necessary for