

*Adjournment Motion***PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT  
MOTION**

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 66, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp)—Co-operatives—Task force report—Government reponse. (b) Encouragement for co-operatives; the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway)—Insurance—Liability insurance—Request reinsurance market be organized; the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo)—Agriculture—Assistance for grain producers. (b) Provision of funds.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**CANADAIR LIMITED DIVESTITURE ACT**

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mrs. McDougall that Bill C-25, an Act to authorize the divestiture of Canadair Limited and to provide for other matters in connection therewith, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, it seems that each time Christmas arrives the Conservative Government wants to give evidence of its munificence to the corporate sector. Last year there was the tremendous giveaway of de Havilland. This year, in what is almost a repeat performance in celebration of the start of the Christmas season, we have before us this tremendous gift package for our approval. As much as I am in favour of Christmas, there are some more deserving candidates than Bombardier and Boeing Corporation. In looking at those two instances of what is frankly a gross sell-out of assets belonging to the people of Canada, it seems to me completely different arguments are being used to justify the two sales.

I would like to do something that I have yet to see done in this House by paying a tribute to Canadair, its management and workers. They succeeded in what was a very difficult situation. General Dynamics had sold them out. They faced a very difficult period of time in developing a new and important product, the Challenger, at great cost. They succeeded in carrying that plane through to successful development. That is a great example of the research and development we have to support, albeit at a lesser cost in the future.

Besides the Challenger, which is typically associated with Canadair, there is a tremendous amount of work, much of it highly sophisticated and very successful, which has taken place on pilotless reconnaissance planes. So much so that throughout

the Western Alliance, Canadair is recognized as one of the leading producers of pilotless drones. In fact, shortly before the company was sold, it signed with the Federal Republic of Germany and with France a Memorandum of Understanding to proceed jointly with the pre-production phase of the Canadair CL-289 pilotless airborne reconnaissance system. This is just one example of the tremendous success which the engineers, technicians and working people at Canadair have succeeded in achieving over the difficult past 11 years.

• (1630)

I would now like to deal with the fundamental inconsistency in the argument made initially with respect to de Havilland and now with respect to Canadair. I am sure we all recall the compelling argument put forward with extreme force by the previous Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion with regard to de Havilland. The argument was that first we had to have world-wide connections to sell the aerospace products which we were producing in this country. Second, we had to have world-wide input of technology on which we could call in order to be successful in a very difficult high technology industry. The Government of Canada decided that the Boeing Corporation, with its world-wide marketing network and tremendous access to technology, was the best hope for de Havilland. In fact, the previous speaker referred to this at some length and made very much of it.

We now have a quite similar company, Canadair. The first suggestion being made is that there be no company brought in which has a world-wide network of aerospace marketing capacity. Second, there is no suggestion made that we must have technology available to the engineers and technicians at Canadair because they certainly will not get the world-wide capacity to market or the tremendous technological in-pup from Bombardier.

I will read you an assessment of Bombardier, not from a trade union source, but from the Canadian Aerospace Corporation. It assesses Bombardier in the following terms:

The management culture (at Bombardier) is also oriented towards the licensed manufacture of ground transport . . . . The capital intensive demands of aerospace research and development are simply not conducive to the heavy manufacturing culture at Bombardier. Bombardier then, has a tremendous political advantage over the other competing bidders, however they have not yet assembled the aerospace partners or capital required to make Canadair viable in the long term.

That is absolutely diametrically opposed to the argument made in the case of de Havilland. The Government cannot use one piece of logic to deal with one corporation and apply completely contradictory logic to another corporation if it expects the Canadian people to take it seriously.

The Conservative Member who spoke last used a phrase which indicated that the Government was not just looking to increase government coffers. I hope I have that quotation correct. Such a phrase in any speech is a sure tip-off that the taxpayers of the country are somehow getting squeezed, somehow getting skewered, somehow being pushed to pay a cost which should be paid by a private company. When