Transportation Policy

ferry. However, I should be pleased to discuss this point with the hon. member some other time.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Although I do not intend to interfere unduly with the process of the minister's being questioned, I am sure all members agree that questions ought to be kept to matters of general policy and ought not to become a litany, as it were, of individual problems in individual corners of the country, or questions concerning the specific application of the policy. The minister said that he would be willing to answer such questions in committee. I think he is correct in that. I hope hon. members will keep their questions to matters of general policy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to put. I am sorry I was unable to hear all the questions that followed the minister's statement. I should like to ask the minister whether, within his overall transportation policy, recognition will be given the St. Lawrence Seaway, which is undeniably an important part of our transportation system, and whether he intends, within that policy, to review the financing of the seaway because, at the present time, as a result of high interest rates, the debt is not "covering" expenses. Does the minister intend to review, within the scope of that policy, all those forms of refinancing?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I have asked that not only the refinancing of the St. Lawrence Seaway be reviewed but also that of the Canadian National.

[*English*]

Mr. Railton: Mr. Speaker, although I am particularly interested in the Welland Canal and the Seaway, I shall ask a question on general policy. I think many members of this House are interested in seeing deepsea ports and large centres on the St. Lawrence connected and the Seaway enlarged. Enlarging the Seaway will involve the building of deepwater harbours, the enlargement of locks serving the international Seaway and the enlargement of the Welland Canal. What is the Department of Transport's policy for financing this future great undertaking? Also, is there any way of recouping the cost of these works from other nations using the Seaway?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I must discuss this question with the Minister of Finance and Treasury Board. So far, no decision has been taken on the financing of this matter.

● (1730)

Mr. Firth: I should like to ask the minister a question or two regarding the licensing of air crew. This is an important topic, especially north of the 60th parallel where it is recognized that pilots trained in areas with which they are familiar are better and safer than operators who come from some other area. This was recognized not too long ago by those engaged in an inquiry into a crash in the north. Would the minister recognize this extra proficiency by authorizing a special stamp on aircrew licences or log books? I might say that though very few northern native people have been trained as pilots, their records are just a

little better than excellent. Would the minister consider authorizing a mark of recognition, one which would be accepted not only by the government but by the companies which employ these men, and by the insurance companies?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): This is the type of question I should like to answer in committee when my advisers are with me. I am not a specialist in all these matters; if I were, I would probably not be here. The hon. member will forgive me if I cannot take a chance on giving him an answer before consulting with my people.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a question or two with respect to this concept of cost recovery. We read on page 10 that there should be an objective of commercial viability including cost recovery. Elsewhere the minister spoke of the desirability of the various transportation services being integrated—he intends to try to integrate them. Does this mean the minister will try to extend the concept of cost recovery to water services, for example, where the government engages in dredging or the maintenance of canals? I mention the St. Lawrence Seaway, for instance. Is it intended to apply this concept of cost recovery to all forms of transportation?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I think the answer is no. It is clear in my mind, at least, that in certain cases we shall insist on cost recovery and that in other cases it would be impossible to do so. This is why we divided Canada into major areas and non-major areas, developing regions and so on. We know that we shall probably have to apply special principles to the developing regions—that the user charge recovery principle will not be applicable.

Mr. Stanfield: Perhaps on another occasion I can ascertain whether the minister considers central Canada to be a developing region or not.

The minister indicated in the course of one of his answers that where there is no competition, in other words, where the principles of the 1967 act do not provide satisfactory control through competition, the government would set the rates. I wonder whether he meant that. Did he not mean, rather, that the government would determine, in such circumstances, that the rate would be set in accordance with principles other than the principle of competition?

Did he mean that where the government finds there is no competition it would itself establish the rate, or did he mean that the government would lay down some different principle by which the CTC would set the rate? In the latter case, is the hon. gentleman in a position to indicate what the general principle would be? In cases where there is competition, the principles set forth in the existing act would, presumably, continue to apply. But what principle will the government follow if it finds there is no competition?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I think the hon. gentleman's second version is the correct one. We do not intend to fix the rates arbitrarily. I would not like to have the job of fixing rates for all Canada. I already have enough to do. What we could do is set a number of rules for the CTC to apply when fixing these rates. I cannot tell the hon.