

Air Canada

they would have \$1 billion to \$1½ billion to start a guaranteed annual income scheme in this country. We do not want to live in a country in which forever the lowest 25 per cent of the people are going to get 4 per cent of the gross national product.

I must say that I have become somewhat modified since coming to parliament. I realize, now, that many politicians work very hard and that they deserve to be higher than they are in the so-called pecking order, but, for God's sake, is not the time here for us to say in this country, in North America, that we cannot go on in this way, that we just have to make sacrifices in order that the lower income people, both here and in other parts of the world, get their fair share? Rhetoric alone will do nothing. We have to build the institutions which will make this possible, and if this is ranting, raving socialism, I apologize to my hon. friends.

● (2215)

When you know them well enough, they are all nice fellows in this Chamber, whether they are from the Liberal party, the Conservative party or whatever. I am talking about human beings. We are a very small percentage of the human beings who live on this earth, and unless we distribute income and wealth in a fairer way we shall find ourselves in still greater difficulty—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. My intention is not to remind the hon. member that his time has expired but merely to ask him to come back to the subject matter of the amendment which is before us.

Mr. Hogan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I come from the Atlantic region and I can tell you that in the Atlantic region, because of over-emphasis on the profit motive by a Crown corporation, we are getting less service. It is true that only 5 or 10 per cent of our people use the airlines anyway, and we in this Chamber are among those who are so privileged. But there are a lot of people who find they need to fly in certain circumstances because, for example, of the death of relatives living far away in other parts of the country. They are getting short-changed.

I want to tell the hon. member from the Kootenay area that we all understand the need for good business management and so on. But the Minister of Transport is one of the most conservative men I have ever met in my life—next to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner)! That man has no idea what it means to live in an outpost in Newfoundland, or what it means to live in isolated areas where transportation facilities are desperately needed. This does not mean you say “to hell with costs completely”. Obviously, the Canadian taxpayer, through income tax or sales tax, or indirectly through the very weak corporation taxes, would in the end have to pick up the bill. There has to be a balance.

We are not complaining that a profit might be made. But we suspect that a profit will be made, as has been done so often in the past, at the price of service to Canadians. It is that type of thinking, especially if it is pursued to a logical conclusion in

[Mr. Hogan.]

line with the wishes of the Minister of Transport, which will lead Canadians into great difficulty.

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the socialists are at it again tonight and I think it is important that we should first of all take a look at what they are proposing. Many of their speeches have wandered from the point.

The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) spent a lot of time on the phrase “contemplation of profit” and that is what they said they intended to delete. But that is not exactly what the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) proposed to delete. It is going to delete the contemplation of profit, but it will also delete the requirement that the Board shall have due regard to sound business principles. It is important to emphasize that, because the type of thinking—

● (2222)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Read the rest of it.

Mr. Stevens: —the socialists have been espousing here tonight is the type of thinking that the Trudeau Liberal government has been following for years. The hon. member decries unemployment. I agree with him, but the unemployment he decries is due to those very socialistic principles which are being espoused in this House tonight.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I will not take any more than a minute of the hon. member's time, but I should like to remind the hon. member that I come from an area in which private enterprise left us high and dry. With all the faults of this government, if it did not take over the coal mines and it failed to take over the steel mills, we would be in a worse position.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is making an argument.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, before we vote on the proposed amendment, I think it is important for us to see in its entirety what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre intends to delete from the bill before us. According to his motion, he intends to delete lines 6 to 9 on page four of the bill. Those lines read as follows:

In discharging its responsibilities under this act, the Board shall have due regard to sound business principles, and in particular the contemplation of profit.

Let us not allow the socialists to confuse this issue. They are making a two-pronged attack. First of all, they want to make sure that the directors are not going to be required to follow sound business principles, and second, that they should not carry out their activities in contemplation of profit.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Primarily.

Mr. Stevens: It does not say “primarily”. This is the type of confusion the hon. member continually attempts to put into this bill. If they want to espouse their garbage, I think it is