

Oral Questions

I said that in my judgment the utilization of the invocation of this clause in these circumstances by the American government is an abuse of the process. It was an abuse of the process and this view is an important one on behalf of Canadians and has been conveyed to our American interlocutors on this.

We are going to follow the rule of law and we are going to advance at this stage all of the Canadian arguments that have successfully been advanced and deployed thus far.

My hon. friend then raises hypothetical questions about what if, what if, and what if. We began this believing we were right to proceed this way to defend the interests of Canadian pork producers. We did that. We won. We did it again and we won then. We believe that by following that same course, we are going to win again.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, what precisely this government is going to do is to go from one trade deal, which it is questioning for abuse, to a further trade deal with the United States and Mexico.

We know that a report has been prepared with respect to labour legislation comparing Mexico, the United States and Canada. It is a report by Labour Canada. It was supposed to be tabled today. I want to ask the Prime Minister why it is that this important document has not been tabled in this House today.

What is holding back this government from telling Canadians about this important study? Why is it holding it back?

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate characteristic of the New Democratic Party to attribute the worst motives to everyone with whom they disagree. That is why they are trying to justify on trade grounds a position that at base is simply, in the worst sense of the word, anti-Mexican. That is why they are trying to justify on trade grounds a position that is at base opposed to everything they say they stand for in terms of international development and encouragement of the Third World. That is a despicable position for any political party.

The report will be tabled later today.

DE HAVILLAND

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. I have in hand a copy of a study sent personally to the Prime Minister on February 5 which outlined the potential job devastation, not only for de Havilland, Toronto's largest industrial employer, but for companies across the country that supply de Havilland, the devastation that a foreign government takeover of the company could cause.

The study outlines that suppliers across the country account for \$169 million in revenues, specifically \$2.5 million in Alberta, \$2 million in Atlantic Canada, \$6.5 million in British Columbia, \$11 million in Manitoba, \$82 million in the province of Quebec and \$65 million in the province of Ontario.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister why, having received this information personally two months ago, did he insist in the House yesterday that he was not going to reverse the takeover of de Havilland?

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said yesterday, that the application will have to go first to Investment Canada.

I would like to underline something that the member says. It is usual for her to make a presentation about effects may happen in two or three years. They are not there. What is there today is a company which Boeing proposes to sell to a consortium of European companies. It will have to be assessed very seriously by Investment Canada. The company in 1986 had 4,400 workers and today there are 4,900 people working in the company. We are trying to consider the way that we will deal with that in the future.

I ask the member to not just throw around figures which are not there. They are possible in her view, but for God's sake, could we have the truth, the real truth, here today.

[Translation]

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, it is shameful, because the Industry Minister himself received the same study on February 5. I will tell him what that study says. Suppliers in the province of Quebec alone account for 48.7 per cent, for a total income of \$82 million, most of that in Montreal.