

### *Government Orders*

Africa that do not have our expertise in the fishery and do not have advanced fishing technology in place, are kicking out those foreign nations. Those foreign boats do not have very many places to go now, so one of the places they pick on is our Canadian east coast.

• (1740)

I am not talking about outside 200 miles, because we do not have jurisdiction, but we have jurisdiction for these licences granted to Cuba, Japan, the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Norway, Poland, and the U.S.A. We have jurisdiction tomorrow when a Japanese vessel comes in to port in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and gets from fisheries and oceans tomorrow afternoon a licence to fish what we commonly call turbot inside our 200-mile zone in areas called 2-G and 2-H off the Labrador coast.

What does that have to do with the bill? That has everything to do with the bill, because the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is paying for the follies of the Government of Canada. It is in a position where it owes money. It is being disbanded. Why else would the Government of Canada issue half or 50 per cent lay-off notices to all its staff in eastern Canada? It is an outrage.

Another portion of the bill authorizes the collection of user fees from the federal government. Imagine one government department charging another government department for use of its services. That is what it says in this bill. Another portion of the bill gives authority to charge provincial governments user fees for their services.

In the last intervention I said that I would mention in conclusion the authority given, as the government had announced prior to this bill, to government departments to collect revenues and to use those revenues as expenditures in their own departments. That is what it does in section 12 of the act. It allows a department to do it. It says that a department may be authorized to do it.

We are faced today in Canada with the probable closure of air traffic control services in western Canada, in British Columbia, and in the far east of our great country. We are facing that because the Government of Canada and the Auditor General, I believe, determined

that the work being done in those control centres could be done in a control centre in downtown Montreal.

That is one side of the picture, but that department of the Government of Canada collects revenues that far exceed their expenditures. What happens to those revenues? They go into what we call the Consolidated Revenue Fund. They do not go into the Department of Transport to keep these operations going. If we examine the figures of air traffic control stations in British Columbia and in eastern Canada, in Newfoundland or New Brunswick, we would discover an interesting fact. The system is that a foreign aircraft carrier which comes within a national airspace pays a fee for the air traffic control services it gets. It is about \$85 per initial contact. That is the way it is worded. Then it pays another fee, about \$50 I believe—it used to be \$40—for what we used to call radio services. That is when you speak to somebody about weather conditions and the like.

The average fee is \$100 per initial contact for these trans-Pacific and trans-oceanic flights. There are about 500 a day on average, west coast, and east coast. That would cost approximately \$50,000 a day. Air traffic control generates about \$15 million to \$20 million a year in eastern and western Canada. That money goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. They make more than they spend. They are not only making their salaries, they are making double their salaries. But that does not show up in the department. That is not what this means. What this means is that where the government so wishes, a government department may be encouraged to charge fees which will then become a part of a pot of money within that department that can be spent as they see fit.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, is incomplete. The legislation should say that each government department which generates revenue will receive that revenue and will be responsible for that revenue.

In conclusion, let me say that this is a very bad piece of legislation. It is a terrible piece of legislation. It will increase charges on the general public, on provincial governments, and it will lead the Government of Canada down some very poor paths as far as collecting money is concerned from a lot of poor people in this country.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?