

According to these carriers, route denial preempts the ability of Toronto to become a hub. It is not feasible for feeder carriers to use satellite airports.

- Views of these carriers were divided on the question of restrictions on transborder services: some carriers favoured an open border; other carriers expressed the view that U.S. carriers would engage in predatory actions to remove them from certain routes.
- Generally these carriers opposed Canada exchanging cabotage rights with the United States. Where cabotage was supported it was limited to support for transborder route extension cabotage only.
- These carriers generally asked that preclearance be eliminated. They viewed preclearance as providing an unfair advantage to United States carriers. At Terminal I in Toronto, the United States refuses to preclear aircraft of 19 seats or less. Some carriers viewed this as discriminatory and submitted that if preclearance was to remain, all carriers, regardless of the size of aircraft, should be treated on a non-discriminatory basis. It was submitted that there should be post-clearance at suitable U.S. airports.
- These carriers supported code sharing. This would enhance their ability to provide connecting service to major carriers.
- In the case of certain of the smaller transborder carriers that were not aligned with major carriers, concern was expressed that interline connections were displayed further down CRS screens than on-line connections. The problem is exacerbated when code sharing connections