

*Oral Questions*

In making a decision to include full cabotage on the table, the minister blatantly ignored the same committee's view which said that if the mega-American carriers were given cabotage rights, it would devastate our airline industry. We do not think that American carriers should be given cabotage rights under a new agreement.

I ask the minister again: Will he take cabotage off the table?

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend would agree that there has been perhaps a slip in the words.

My hon. friend refers to the parliamentary report. I would refer him to the place where he says that the report makes an observation. The *status quo* is not acceptable.

The report makes another observation. We would encourage our negotiating team to explore the feasibility of obtaining exclusive cabotage rights for our Canadian carriers.

We are in these negotiations to get a better deal for Canadian consumers, a better deal for Canadian communities and more opportunities for our airlines. We intend to do that.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

The minister does not seem to understand that there is a difference between cabotage for Canadian carriers and across the board cabotage which would allow the Americans to not only compete head on head, but would eliminate the Canadian industry.

Given this government's record in the transportation sector, whether it is marine, shipbuilding, air or road, it has systematically destroyed our infrastructure. When is the minister going to finally stand up and fight on behalf of the Canadian industry instead of working for a better deal for the Americans and the Europeans?

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** To my friend of the *status quo*, I would say this.

First of all, if we understand the situation, cabotage is a red herring. The real issue here is improved access: slots, gates and preclearance. The full issue has to be examined.

I said to my friend: We are in these negotiations to get a better deal. Any time I ever got involved in negoti-

ations, I did not take anything off the table before I got in the room.

\* \* \*

**DE HAVILLAND**

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

I would like to recall to him his words when he blessed the fire sale of de Havilland to Boeing more than five years ago. I quote: "What we are doing today is saving de Havilland and securing jobs for de Havilland workers. There will not be fewer jobs, but more jobs."

According to the union officials today, the direct result of this decision to consummate a new sale will be the loss of 1,700 jobs in Toronto alone.

• (1430)

Instead of hiding behind the guise of Investment Canada, which has never taken its responsibilities over the last six years seriously, will the Prime Minister today send a message that this sale will not be sanctioned, that he will have the courage to stop this sale?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology has laid out for the Leader of the Opposition the requirements that one must follow in seeking to deal with the problem that is raised.

There are rules and regulations that follow from the Investment Canada Act, all of which must be respected in considering this matter, and that is what the minister is in the process of doing.

I point out to my hon. friend, since she refers to a statement made in the House some five years ago, that at the time the company was in financial difficulty. Since Boeing took over it has invested some \$1 billion, I believe, of new money in the company. The number of jobs was increased to 4,600, I believe, from 3,600. So, the experience that was opposed by the Liberals at the time was not unfavourable for the workers of Toronto. Their jobs concern us a great deal.

I do not think that the jobs of workers in Ontario or elsewhere are helped by a xenophobic attack on foreign investment, because Canada needs foreign investment across Canada, from Atlantic Canada to British Columbia. We are going to invite foreign investment and create national investment rather than put up borrowed taxpayers' money across Canada.