National Transportation Act, 1986

on television; as for the rest, we were being conned in every way possible.

This was evidenced by the softwood lumber issue. We cannot blame the French, nor the Germans, nor the Russians. We cannot blame others. They tell each other: "Listen, in Canada, you just call the Prime Minister, and you need give him only two or three slaps on the wrist for him to give in. He's got no backbone, he doesn't stand up. You saw what the Americans did, he gave away everything; and on top of that he imposed a tax and it didn't take long for the Canadian Parliament to launch a debate on the decision taken in the United States to impose a duty. What's more, the Americans will monitor where the money from the softwood lumber tax will go."

The French are as bright as the others. They were quick to realize that since the Prime Minister, the "guy in charge in Canada", had no backbone, why should they not try and get a bigger part of the fisheries? They felt they could get what they wanted. There again other negotiations began in no time. There again, as a consolation prize, our Prime Minister got to appear on television in France. But that does not bring anything to Canadians, and in the Atlantic provinces, as well as in the Gaspé area, in Quebec, once more it will be Canadians, Quebecers, Newfoundlanders who will be penalized in that area.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we are stuck with a decision and, as we witnessed in the pharmaceutical products issue, it is not by coincidence if the Government is suddenly kowtowing to the multinationals. They say that research is important in the area of pharmaceutical products. But the Government has cut research funding. Why ask the sick to pay for research when the money could have come from elsewhere? No, the truth is that the Government has yielded again on that issue because of pressures exerted by important and powerful people, and it is more of the same in the area of transport.

My time is up, Mr. Speaker. I do hope that the government will listen to the voice of reason, not that of the official Opposition, not that of political parties, but the voice of the Canadian population and that it will act with the care that is expected from a government. Because in the area of deregulation, there is no chance to take. If disaster strikes following irresponsible action, that cannot be repaired.

I call on all Members of the House to be careful and to demand that the Government be careful and slow down the pace of deregulation and make the necessary changes to its Bill.

The Acting Speaker (M. Paproski): Questions and comments. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Bertrand).

Mrs. Bertrand: Mr. Speaker, I am far from being an expert in that field, but I listened anyway to the Hon. Member from Montréal—Sainte-Marie, who is always acting as a defender of the poor and the needy, give as an example an airline, People Express in fact, and I would ask him by the way, to

familiarize himself with the region, because People Express flights did not leave from Plattsburgh, but from Burlington, which is located at the other end of Lake Champlain, quite a distance from there. I am speaking of a company which was most popular. People from Montreal would leave in full busloads, there were line-ups, travelers had to arrive hours in advance, because that airline offered such good service. It must have been safe since so many people dared to use it, and I was among those travelers. As far as in-flight service was concerned, of course there was no tablecloth and no silverware, but we were served a meal and we could travel to New York. That airline was successful as long as its prices were reasonable. Suddenly it changed policy, seeking to attract customers looking for somewhat more comfortable and more luxurious travelling. What happened? It went under. If it had maintained a level of services intended for less demanding customers, it would probably have survived.

So I say again to my colleague who fancies himself as the champion of the needy that he should again today stand up for the consumers.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Hon. Member gave that example. But her example clearly shows that, first of all, she did not realize that when she bought-and she is not without money as far as I know-a ticket from People's Express, this meant the loss of a job elsewhere. She was making other people poor that were not before. And the best proof is that if the company has failed, it is because this could not work, it was a lure to get passengers, a bluff in the first place. What I would like to know is when the Hon. Member who just asked the question boards a plane, whether she knows about safety, if the aircraft is well inspected. Personally, I have had no experience there. When I board a plane I take safety for granted, I assume there were so many mechanics to do repair and inspection work. But the example she just gave I think merely proves that if this had been good, if it had been an effective regulation, it would have benefited consumers. People's Express would still be around. They would not have had to increase their rates. But if they had to increase their rates, and still went bankrupt, it is because this is the law of the jungle, the big fish eats the smaller ones. Certainly we would have had the same result, even with deregulation. The new company that wants to kill Air Canada, to do away with a few thousand jobs at Air Canada, will offer lower rates, but once it gets into a monopoly situation it will act like the financial sharks. You do not know how financial sharks operate. First, they offer a very high discount, but once they have a hold on you, interests go up.

That is the trick, and that is what you clearly proved with your example, that deregulation does not profit consumers because the service which you used no longer exists.

Mr. Grondin: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out to the Hon. Member for Brome—Missisquoi (Mrs. Bertrand) that, when you say that Burlington is far from Plattsburgh, you